

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN his recent work on *The Gospel in the Early Church*, Emeritus Professor James MACKINNON considers the strength of the appeal of the Christian message.

---

In the first place, the gospel had an immense advantage over the rival religions of the ancient Roman world in possessing an historic Founder, whose claims to allegiance in the moral and spiritual sphere were based on the solid fact of a unique personality. No mythical figure, like Attis, or Sarapis, or Mithras, could present a claim comparable to that of Jesus. And in keeping with the historic personality was the teaching: the infinite love and the redemptive purpose of God; the possibility and the actuality of a new life here and life eternal hereafter; the imminent end of the present æon, with the prospect of the deliverance of man and the universe from the demonic power of evil.

---

In the second place, the gospel had also an immense advantage in being able to appeal to the testimony of the Christian life. The early Christian communities, despite all blemishes, were the nurseries of an enthusiasm in well-doing, of a passionate devotion to the highest, unparalleled in the religious history of the time. The history of early Christianity is the history of a power not only of religious revolution but of moral regeneration, even if the real fell short of the ideal.

In the third place, the influence of its Scriptures was part of the strength of the appeal of early Christianity. It is not only that the Gospels and the Epistles are so heart-searching and soul-compelling, but the adoption of the Old Testament as a Christian book gave to Christianity an antiquity and a prestige which it could not have derived from the apostolic writings. Here was unrolled the authoritative record of the Divine activity and the Divine will in creation and history, such as no other document, however ancient, could supply.

---

In the fourth place, the gospel owed some measure of its appeal to the tendency of Christianity to adapt itself to its environment—a process which began with the universalism of Paul and was developed by the Apologists, who proclaimed Christianity as the true philosophy. But paganism tended to react on Christianity and to impart a sensuous, materialistic significance and content to Christian beliefs and rites, transforming in the case of the sacraments the symbol into the thing symbolized. None the less there was great missionary value for the spread of the gospel in the accommodating tendency, however questionable the effects it might have in course of time.

---

In the fifth place, another powerful factor in the success of the gospel appeal is to be found in the personality of some of the Christian missionaries. Especially in the Apostolic Age the man was almost as important as his message—Peter, Paul, the

mystic author of the Fourth Gospel, and the host of apostles, prophets, and teachers who were their fellow-workers in the sustained missionary effort which carried the gospel, within a generation, from Jerusalem to Rome. But it was from the moral and religious, rather than the intellectual, side of personality that Christianity derived its power to conquer the world: from Nero to Diocletian at any rate the martyrs were the greatest missionaries.

Finally, the organization of the Christian communities lent a powerful force to the Christian mission. In the earliest period the apostles, prophets, and teachers were an itinerant class, 'speaking the Word of God' from city to city. But soon organization became a necessity, and it was developed in the struggle with Montanism and Gnosticism, till the Christian Church became a highly organized league, like that which the Empire represented in the political sphere. And the efficacy of the organization became irresistible when the religious and political spheres were allied, and Church and State united in the prosecution of the same end.

There was a time, not so very long ago, when it was customary to accentuate the isolation of Israel, as a people little, if at all, affected by the political and religious influences that shaped the life of her neighbours and that pervaded the great contemporary empires—as, in short, a people dwelling apart and alone. The historians, the archaeologists, and the excavators have put an end to all that. They have made it indisputably and abundantly clear that Israel was profoundly affected, not only by the politics, but by the religions of the dominant empires, and very particularly by the religions of Egypt and Babylon.

How impossible it has become to think of Israel in isolation will be forcibly brought home to the most rigid traditionalist by a book on *Myth and Ritual* which has just been published by the Oxford University Press (10s. 6d. net)—a book so fascinating that we have paid it the rare compliment of reading most of it twice. The editor, Professor S.

H. HOOKE, who contributes two of the essays, one on 'The Myth and Ritual Pattern of the Ancient East,' and the other on 'Traces of the Myth and Ritual Pattern in Canaan,' has gathered a number of brilliant scholars together who can speak with authority on the themes he assigned them. Dr. A. M. BLACKMAN writes on 'Myth and Ritual in Ancient Egypt,' Mr. C. J. GADD on 'Babylonian Myth and Ritual,' Dr. F. J. HOLLIS on 'The Sun-cult and the Temple at Jerusalem,' Professor W. O. E. OESTERLEY on 'Early Hebrew Festival Rituals,' Dr. E. O. JAMES on 'Initiatory Rituals,' and Professor T. H. ROBINSON on 'Hebrew Myths.' All these discussions are prefaced by an illuminating Foreword from the pen of Canon D. C. SIMPSON.

The simple collocation of the words 'myth' and 'ritual' is the key to one aspect of the book, which repeatedly emphasizes the peculiarly intimate connexion between these two things. In worship certain things were done and certain things were said, and the things that were said were, in a sense, the exposition of the things that were being dramatically done, and they had a certain magical efficacy of their own. The Babylonian Creation Epic, for example, of which Mr. GADD gives a very vivid account, is not simply a piece of mythology setting forth the Babylonian view of origins; it was part of the worship. It was recited from beginning to end by the high priest, late in the evening of the fourth day of the festival of the New Year celebrations, before the image of Marduk. That Epic, Mr. GADD insists, was not composed merely as *belles lettres*; it was to be recited as part of the New Year ritual, and the recitation was believed to have a magical virtue. 'It is probably not too bold to affirm that all Babylonian mythology is magical in purpose, and directly or indirectly forms an efficient part of some incantation.'

For many readers the chief interest of the book will probably lie in its broad suggestion, supported by much convincing detail, that Hebrew ritual, and consequently Hebrew myth, reproduce, doubtless in a disintegrated form, the myth and ritual 'pattern' of the great religious systems of Egypt and Babylonia. Professor HOOKE has made this so



probable as to be practically certain for Canaan. His main thesis, he justly claims, appears to be substantiated; and that thesis is 'that the general pattern of Canaanite myth and ritual, though modified in transmission, was ultimately derived from an earlier pattern; to this earlier pattern Egypt, and, to a still greater degree Babylon, had contributed the dominant characteristics.' And Israel, we must remember, fell heir to the Canaanite civilization—to this aspect of it doubtless, as well as to others.

Now what was this general 'pattern,' as it is called? Following Professor Hooke, Dr. OESTERLEY summarizes it thus: (a) a dramatic representation of the death and resurrection of the god, with whom the king was identified; (b) a recitation or symbolic representation of the myth of creation; (c) a ritual combat, in which the triumph of the god over his enemies was depicted; (d) a sacred marriage; (e) a triumphal procession, in which the king played the part of the god; and (f) the importance of the king for the well-being of the community.

The simple reader of the Old Testament, uninitiated into the ways of ancient Oriental religion, may well ask in wonder where the Hebrew parallels to such a pattern are to be found. He can think of nothing remotely representing the death and resurrection of the god, and still less of the sacred marriage. But to some features of the 'pattern' there are undoubtedly analogies which cannot be fairly described as far-fetched. The Norwegian scholar Mowinkel has made it extremely probable that certain 'Processional Psalms' were sung by the Hebrews at a New Year Festival of the enthronement of Jehovah, and such a psalm as 24<sup>7-10</sup> may well have formed part of the ceremony of the entry of Jehovah into the sacred precincts, and, as such, have been sung not on one occasion only, but every year, and the Elephantine papyri have disclosed the curious fact that, in Egypt at any rate, even as late as the fifth century B.C., there was a goddess, Anath, associated with Jehovah.

These facts, together with certain others, lend

considerable plausibility to the following conjectural reconstruction of the myth-ritual pattern as it appeared in pre-exilic Israel. The reconstruction is Professor T. H. ROBINSON'S, and these are his words: 'It necessarily began with the removal of Jahweh and Anath from their home in the Temple, and with their occupation of a sacred hut in the neighbourhood of the sanctuary, probably in a vineyard. Then began the story of Creation, opening with the great contest of Jahweh against the powers of Chaos. This probably took different forms in different sanctuaries, but the issue was everywhere the victory of Jahweh. The divine marriage followed, consummated in the sacred hut, and this was succeeded by the death of Jahweh. After a period of lamentation He was restored to life, and, with His consort, was led to His home in the Temple, there to reign until the changes of the year brought back again the festival season.'

The reader to whom this reconstruction seems too outrageously bold to be probable must be referred to the arguments by which Dr. ROBINSON leads up to and supports it, and also to the general impression, left by the other essayists, of the dominance of the 'pattern' and of certain features in Hebrew religion which can be most naturally explained as in some intimate way connected with it. The prophets, of course, denounced such features as were inconsistent with their own nobler conceptions of religion; but those features were there.

There is much else in this striking book to rivet the attention. Of peculiar interest, for example, is Dr. HOLLIS'S contention that 'solar myth and ritual were to the front in Solomon's Temple,' that Sun-worship was prevalent in Israel and particularly in the Temple at Jerusalem, and that the Temple itself may have had its origin in an eclipse of the sun which took place in 948 B.C.

If all the suggestions in this book proved true, Old Testament religion would be more interesting and wonderful than ever; for while it borrowed heavily from other religions, it had an inherent quality which enabled it, on its higher reaches, on the one hand to eliminate all that was unworthy of



association with itself, and on the other to adapt to its own higher use such features as lent themselves to assimilation, and, in adapting, to transform them.

---

Dr. Hensley HENSON, the Bishop of Durham, has issued a small book, *The Group Movement* (Milford; 2s. 6d. net), in which he embodies his considered judgment of the 'Oxford Group' and its activities. The book contains the first part of his charge, delivered at the third quadrennial visitation of his diocese. He was led to this theme by two facts. He found that 'Groupism,' as he calls the Movement, had been interesting many church people in the diocese. And a considerable number of such people had come to him for counsel and direction on the matter. We have, then, in this little book of about eighty pages the conclusions of one of the most penetrating intellects in the religious world of our day on a subject of outstanding interest to religious people.

---

First of all the Bishop deals with the Movement generally. In the second part of the charge he handles the specific characteristics of the Group propaganda. With regard to the Movement generally, he lays down certain general principles which seem to be relevant. In the first place, such Movements are to be found in an age of dislocation (such as has followed the War), and in an age also when the Church has largely sunk into an apathy. They are, therefore, in the nature of revolts and criticisms. And in this respect the Bishop recognizes their relevance and value. He has many severe and faithful words to say about the Church of our time. And, considered in this light, such Movements as 'Groupism' possess real spiritual inspiration.

---

Further, Dr. HENSON recognizes that there have always been two types of religion, the church type and the sect type. Both types are rooted in the Apostolic Age. In other words, both are to be found in the New Testament—the Christianity of the Catholic Church, expressed in hierarchy, sacraments, and formal discipline, and the Christianity

of the individual disciple, expressed in personal reformation and mystical experience. The two are never easy with each other, and often they come into direct conflict. The sect utters a protest against some 'formalism' or other of the Church, and is apt on its own part to become an exaggeration and a tradition. The result is often separation and the formation of a new 'body.'

---

The Oxford Group repudiates the idea of separation from the Church. Mr. Russell, for example, in 'For Sinners Only' says: 'They wished to be an inner church in all churches, irrespective of denomination, for the deepening of spiritual life within Christ's body. . . . In fact, a power-house within and without the churches.' No doubt, comments the Bishop, but then every sect begins with the same profession, and in a very interesting passage he gives chapter and verse. The Quakers, for example, never for a moment thought of forming another denomination at the outset. Yet to-day they are the most self-contained of religious communities. It was the same with the Methodists, as is very well known.

---

One other general point occupies the Bishop for some time. The Groupists claim to be recovering and reproducing the religion of the Apostles. Their Movement is an essay in first-century Christianity, and the New Testament provides them with all the direction they need. They are seeking, in the words of one of their expositors, 'to recapture the life and power and fellowship in Christ as it was in New Testament days.' But this, Dr. HENSON contends, cannot reasonably be done. For the Apostolic Age was totally different from ours, and we are the children of our own age. We must perforce relate the gospel to our own environment, and the Christianity of the twentieth century can never be quite as the Christianity of the first. We had an example of a similar attempt in Mr. Hickson's faith-healing mission, which was hailed by many as a reproduction of primitive Christianity. And this Movement, as well as that led by Dr. Buchman, reveals the note of all sects—the tendency to exaggerate the originality and value of their own methods.



Passing now to the second part of the discussion, we find the Bishop at close grips with the Movement. The three outstanding features of Groupism are Sharing, Guidance, and Loyalty. Sharing means two things, confession and witness. Confession is essential, and Dr. HENSON thinks the Movement has done a real service in emphasizing this eminently Christian discipline. But *public* confession, or 'witnessing,' is a totally different thing, and a very questionable one. It is beset with so many perils, psychological and religious, that only the very strongest and humblest could steer a way safely through them. And these perils are never so serious as when they bear on those in whom, because of their youth, 'the self-confidence of inexperience supplements the unconscious pride of spiritual self-advertisement.'

Guidance, in the Group practice, is the unwholesome emphasis of a very real Christian fact. In the Group it is a normal experience, the ruling authority in daily life, conscious, detailed, and decisive, overriding reason and superseding the most carefully prepared plans. It may, and does sometimes, cancel the most important engagements. 'The faithful servant learnt from his Master each new morning how the day shall be spent.' If God, who is the Lord of all our time, wishes us to go to 'apparently fixed engagements' He will send us to them. If He wills us to break free from them He is able to guide us in that direction also. This doctrine, comments Dr. HENSON, if acted upon, would make social life impossible. God may guide us to make engagements, and then, when they are due, to break them. The Christian life is, and must be, a guided life, but it is a life directed by reason and conscience, illuminated by the Spirit of God, but free and responsible.

Loyalty is the third of the distinctive Group

words. If Dr. HENSON is correct in his facts this would seem to be the most serious defect in the Movement. While the individual adherent of the Group is encouraged to seek guidance and to follow it in detail, regarding it as Divinely authoritative, he is dominated by the Group; and beyond the Group to which he is attached there is an 'Inner Group' over which Dr. Buchman himself presides, and whose decisions are final. Groupism is thus a closed system, as close-knit and dominating as that of the Jesuits, which leaves to the individual Groupist little liberty and no ultimate responsibility. This amazing paradox is difficult to understand. The doctrine of 'Guidance' seems to be purely individualistic, yet the Group authority makes the individual completely subordinate to the system.

Inevitably we have been able only to summarize what is an extremely searching examination of a widely popular Movement. It will be seen that the Bishop of Durham is not aggressively sympathetic with the Group theory or the Group practice. But, in concluding his examination, Dr. HENSON has written some pages that ought to be read by all clergymen, and indeed by all churchmen. He admits the influence and power in the Group Movement. He recognizes the truth in it and the good it has achieved. This truth, and this good, are due to the really Christian elements in it. Its strength lies in these Christian factors, factors which are so largely absent from members of the Church. The unreality of much church religion, its tepid respectability, its insincerity, are humbly and frankly exposed in these searching pages. And the charge, as it ends, pushes home to mind and conscience the need of genuine repentance, the need of that surrender and that witness which have been to many members of these Groups new life and power and freedom.



## Religion and Science as Ways of Knowledge.

BY THE REVEREND CANON OLIVER C. QUICK, D.D., LONDON.

Most of us are somewhat weary of hearing about the conflict between science and religion. But nearly all the intellectual difficulties, which in one form or another press upon us, spring directly or indirectly from the reign of natural science over the modern mind; and our weariness of our perplexities does not make them less urgent or less in need of a genuine solution. So perhaps no apology is necessary for attempting a fresh treatment of a very familiar theme.

I would begin by suggesting that the general difference in point of view between religion and science is somewhat analogous to the difference in point of view between the artist and the craftsman. The artist I understand to be the man who makes things to be admired, the craftsman the man who makes things to be used. The difference between a tool or a piece of machinery and a work of art is that the first is truly itself only when it is being used for an end beyond itself, whereas the second is essentially the expression of some value, and has only to be rightly seen or heard, not used, in order to be appreciated.

Imagine a poet and an expert seaman looking at a sailing-ship. To the poet it is a thing of beauty expressing all the romance of the sea. To the seaman also it may be that—for most sailors are potential poets—but to him it is first and foremost a means of transport. Or imagine an architect and an engineer contemplating Waterloo Bridge and the problems just now connected with it. The first is regarding mainly the value of the architecture itself, the other the function of the structure as a means of supporting weights.

But these differences go farther and deeper. The poet and the architect are each viewing the object as a whole in relation to the whole context in which they see it—the ship as a whole in relation to sea and sky, the bridge as a whole in relation to that particular reach of the river and the buildings on the shore. The seaman and the engineer are each, if only subconsciously, analysing the object into its component parts, and considering how each part is performing its instrumental function. The sailor can explain why each sail is set as it is, and will perhaps criticise in detail the handling of the ship. The engineer thinks of the bridge as a system of forces and pressures, and probably greatly prefers a bridge 'where every bit is

doing its work' to one which is a model of artistic form.

All these differences arise from the fact that an artist is in the strict sense a theorist, a man whose aim is to *see*. The craftsman, the mechanic, the engineer are practical men, who want to use things, and to control other things by their means. That is why they always analyse the objects they contemplate. *Divide et impera* is the motto for controlling Nature as well as for controlling man. But to see and appreciate things in their full significance, you must look at them as wholes. Divide, if you would rule; but unify, if you would admire.

Now at this point, I would suggest, we have reached a principle which helps us to understand a fundamental difference between science and religion, in so far as each is a way of knowing reality.

The ultimate aim of science (though not necessarily of all scientists) is practical. It seeks to enable man to control his environment. That is why it treats the world as a mechanism. I do not mean that the knowledge it gives is not genuine knowledge of truth, or that this truth may be rightly ignored by religion. But I do mean that the knowledge which science seeks and attains is the kind of knowledge which will help man to achieve his purposes of control; and this aim of science explains its method.

What is its method? First, each particular science separates off its own subject-matter from that of other sciences. Psychology takes the mind, biology the living organism, physics and chemistry lifeless matter, and so on. Then, within its subject-matter each science seeks to discover uniform sequences of cause and effect, which show how things work, so that by learning how things work, the human agent may be able to modify their working and direct it. Every obstacle presented to scientific understanding is met by further analysis of the subject-matter into simpler and more elementary components, so that apparent uniformities, which, on examination are found not to hold good of larger or more complex entities, may be replaced by uniformities which do hold good of the smaller or simpler. An excellent, if frivolous, illustration of the method is afforded by a well-known academic fable. A man of some reasoning powers, but no experience, drinks on



successive days whisky-and-water, rum-and-water, and gin-and-water, in considerable quantities. His primary analysis leads him to the conclusion that it is the water which intoxicates. When this hypothesis fails to be verified by experiment, he analyses further and discovers the other uniform element present in all three drinks. It is, I imagine, in this general kind of way that the simpler and less obvious components of the physical universe have been discovered. And in several directions the sciences have pushed their analysis so far that they now deal with entities which are not themselves perceptible at all, but are only guessed at from the changes which they are supposed to cause in perceived phenomena. Physics has dissipated objects first into atoms, then into electrons, and now into event-particles or vibrations of  $x$ . Even biology deals in genes, and psychology has passed into psychoanalysis. The universal rule is that things as significant wholes have no interest for the sciences. For science a whole thing is just a subject for further analysis. The reason is not that science seeks only 'practical' knowledge, in the sense that one may seek to know only how to do things without being really interested in *truth* at all. Science, of course, is interested in truth; but it is that general kind of truth, expressible in 'laws' of cause and effect, which gives knowledge of the mechanism of things and therefore assists man's control of them.

Religion also seeks knowledge, but with an interest which is different, and indeed opposite. In religion man endeavours to know reality, not in order that he may control, but rather that he may be controlled. As Schleiermacher long ago pointed out, 'the instinct of dependence' is fundamental in religion. And as the religious soul can only rest satisfied in worshipping and being wholly dominated by the ultimate reality, so the quest of religion is to see the significance of all things—as pointing to the supreme being present and ultimately manifest in all. And as the purpose of religion in knowing is opposite to that of science, so also are its method and its way of overcoming difficulties. Religion deals with recalcitrant facts not by analysing them, but by synthesizing them with others, by putting them in a wider context, so that the significance, which fails to be apparent in the narrower sphere, may nevertheless manifest itself in the larger. The unquenchable faith of religion is that, if we could but see all, we should find God's ways to man justified in spite of present appearances. It is easy for the mere intellectualist to ridicule the simple believer's consolation that 'God moves in

a mysterious way,' and that one day the reason for what now seems so unintelligible and perverse will surely be revealed. Such is the essential consolation of religious faith, whether in the charcoal-burner or the metaphysician. Faith always seeks to reduce the ugliness of the present by viewing it together with a remembered past or a hoped-for future, and trying to see the goodness of the whole pattern in the wider range. Listen to the Hebrew psalmist:

Hath God forgotten to be gracious?

And will he shut up his loving-kindness in displeasure?

And I said, It is mine own infirmity:

But I will remember the years of the right hand of the most Highest.

I will remember the works of the Lord:

And call to mind thy wonders of old time.

Or hear the modern philosopher-poet:

Grow old along with me!

The best is yet to be,

The last of life, for which the first was made

Our times are in His hand

Who saith 'A whole I planned,

Youth shows but half; trust God: see all nor be afraid!'

Let us consider a further illustration of the difference between the religious and the scientific point of view. Think of their different ways of regarding an act of visual perception, a man looking at a flower. Physics gets to work on it. At once the flower and the light are dissolved into complex systems of wave-groups or vibrations setting other vibrations in motion, until the series of movements travels up the optic nerve to the brain, and then—what sees what? Physics knows nothing either of the percipient or of the object seen; but it may tell me much about the mechanism of my vision which is exceedingly valuable. Psychology will treat in a similar way the mental machinery which is involved in seeing, and give much true and useful information about the origin and nature of visual hallucinations. But how does a religious poet treat the subject?

Flower in the crannied wall,

I pluck you out of the crannies,

I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,

Little flower—but *if* I could understand

What you are, root and all, and all in all,

I should know what God and man is.

And again, of the non-religious man, by antithesis:

A primrose by a river's brim

A yellow primrose was to him,

And it was nothing more.



In those verses of Tennyson and Wordsworth we see the essentially religious way of dealing with a common act of vision. Religion puts it in the widest possible context of relations, and draws out its most universal significance. Thus it is that the scientific and the religious points of view represent different interests. Each gives truth. But science is always interested in the process of vision as a causal series of events, and thereby acquires the knowledge of mechanism which assists control. Religion is interested in the widest meaning of the whole act and object of vision, and thereby acquires the knowledge which leads to worship. And so it is that, while Peter Bell is justly condemned for seeing nothing more than a yellow primrose, the physicist may be as justly commended for seeing nothing like so much.

Here, then, in recognizing difference of function, we should hold the clue to reconciliation. But it is no easy matter to follow it in the maze of modern thought. An epoch dominated by ecclesiastical religion has been succeeded by an epoch dominated by experimental science. And the practical triumphs of experimental science have been so astounding that its limitations as a guide to truth are almost inevitably ignored. In effect, religion and science seem to have changed places. It is to the experimental sciences that men look for the ultimate truth about the world, and for the aims and standards of human life as a whole. Religion has become a departmental activity, intended in the main for a few specialists of peculiar gifts and temperament, while affording one of the subordinate and minor interests in life to a wider circle of mankind. It is the making of religion into an experimental science and the making of experimental science into a religion, which is the deepest source of our intellectual bewilderment.

Experimental science cannot provide the ultimate interpretation either of everything or of anything (if it could do the one, it could do the other); nor can it really set the ultimate aims and standards of life. For its powers remain essentially departmentalized and practical. It teaches us how to do things, while it provides the ever-increasing knowledge and skill which enable us to do more and more. But it cannot teach us what we should want to do, or what should be our aim in doing. And though it provides us with knowledge amazing in range and detail, it is all in principle knowledge of machinery, knowledge of causal sequences, knowledge of how the universe works; it is not knowledge of the intrinsic significance or value of anything at all. Experimental science cannot help

us to appreciate a Beethoven Symphony; it can only inform us about the working of the sound-waves, which are the machinery of music; and to its teaching we owe the power to put the symphony on a gramophone-record and to broadcast it by wireless.

What, therefore, must happen when experimental science sets itself up as a final authority in the realm of truth? Simply this, that it enthrones what is perhaps the most radically false and characteristically modern of all philosophies, the pragmatism which maintains that knowledge, reason, and conscience are themselves but means of action, useful instruments for controlling environment and achieving purpose, mechanisms for assisting the survival and dominance of the race. The consistent pragmatist has to explain all truths and errors, all ideas and ideals, every act of crime or heroism, not as symbolizing or veiling the inner nature of an eternal reality, but simply as so many successful or unsuccessful experiments made by an organism in endeavouring to achieve its own purposes in the world of time. Thus it is that biologists and psychologists commend religion as a means of producing a sense of mystery, without which the human soul feels ill-adapted and uncomfortable; while they would deprecate a meaningless any question whether religious doctrines are really true. The fact that they seldom apply the same strictly pragmatic canons to their own scientific theories is, one supposes, due simply to that scorn of ordinary logic which is one of the intellectual fashions of the day.

Perhaps, however, the most interesting example of pragmatism in practice is to be found in Marxian materialism as it is understood in Soviet Russia. Having rejected the whole notion of eternal reality, the Communists seem to have laid down the absolute dogma that the preservation and survival in time of the Communist State is the one supreme end of all human activities. The Communist State is the working mechanism to which absolute value is attached. It follows that all theories and doctrines are judged, not by their truth, in the ordinary sense of that term, but by their usefulness in securing and advancing the interests of the State. This is the point of the Communist identification of theory with practice. On the same principle, all justice is administered, not with any final regard for what is ordinarily called justice at all, but simply as part of the State's activity of self-preservation, so that the determining consideration in any given case is not whether the accused is guilty or innocent of the crime alleged against him, but



whether his condemnation or acquittal would be most expedient to the Communist authority.<sup>1</sup>

If once experimental science were completely to oust religion or to take its place, I imagine that similar or analogous results would follow everywhere. The one absolute value would be the survival and biological efficiency of human society, and the words truth, right, morality, reason, and conscience would acquire new meanings which would place them in a merely instrumental category. Spiritual life would perish altogether, and the human race would become like an infinitely more complicated and efficient beehive. Thus it might continue aimlessly conquering and surviving until mankind, able at last to do anything it wanted, would perish in the end from not knowing what it wanted to do, or else from an ultimate refrigeration of the atmosphere which would make all insect-life impossible. These are certainly conceivable ways of attaining what the religious man would call perdition—ways more long drawn out and less attractive than the simpler expedient of inventing and letting loose a poison-gas which would finish the sorry business out of hand.

Meanwhile the pressing danger is lest religion and theology themselves should be intimidated into trying to make an agreement whereby they may be allowed to call a certain narrow department of life their own, on condition that they leave the rest to the unchallenged control of experimental science. It is a real temptation to us to allow some arrangement of this sort, which would in effect contradict the very nature of genuine religion. In an age of turmoil, confusion and pessimism, it is becoming more and more attractive to make religion into an asylum and a refuge; and this is a temptation most deadly when it uses the language of other-worldliness. It is so easy to say, 'These problems of unemployment, social reform and industrial and financial organization are, after all, merely secular concerns of this world; but religion is other-worldly, its province is worship and inward devotion.' Such a plea is the worst kind of half-truth. For the effect of allowing it can only be that, while we profess an other-worldly religion, we are acquiescing all the time in the sway of the scientific principles which confine religion to one department of the life of this world. The only true other-world which true religion can recognize is the other-world of God who rules and judges and seeks to redeem this world and all that is in it.

<sup>1</sup> My information about Russian Communism is derived from Gurian's *Bolshevism: Theory and Practice* (Sheed & Ward).

We are sorely tempted to-day to try to make out that God 'breaks through' at certain points of our life and experience, and to confine our communion with God to these points, if only we may exempt them from the criticism which would apply the same canons to these as to the rest. It is as plausible to say 'religion is religion' as to say 'business is business,' with the same implication that one particular part of life is not subject to certain general laws or standards which claim authority over all. There is, therefore, the more need to remember that according to the Christian faith the supreme occasion when God intervened in human life was also the supreme occasion when He refrained from intervention, when, having manifested Himself in the whole manhood of Jesus, He permitted that Man to suffer the extreme of failure and humiliation which the commonest of mankind can endure. When God did not exempt the chosen vessel of His redeeming love from meeting the contradiction and contempt of ordinary men, the Christian must indeed beware of claiming for his religious experience a sanctuary altogether removed from the questionings and problems of the secular intellect. For the tragedy of the earthly life of Jesus was allowed to work itself out to the bitter end, precisely so that afterwards faith might find God's presence in all experience, even 'at the place of a skull,' no less than in the Holy of holies itself. And the scientific criticism of religion may take away from us a deity manifested only in particular experiences, so that in the end we may find the true God working in all.

All life is the sphere of religion, since in all God is working out His eternal purpose. All life also is open to scientific criticism, in so far as it is a spatio-temporal process. Religion needs science to enable it to understand the whole mechanism of process both in religion itself and in the world, and by this understanding to correct narrowness in its own ideas, and to control the better its own processes. Science, on the other hand, needs religion, not to interfere with its methods or conclusions, but to supply the ultimate motive and direction for its whole activity. In religion alone can be found the end and meaning of all life.

Finally, it seems that only in some form of knowing or seeing can we embrace the ultimate end of life. Action is inherently instrumental. It is a means of bringing about something which does not now exist. Assuredly it is not a mere means, when it is personal and moral action; but where there is nothing that needs to be changed, there is no reason to act. In a world conceived of as final



or perfect, the soul must be thought of as losing itself in adoration, vision, contemplation, and as thus transcending the time-process which is realized only as we do things that other things may be brought about. Religion, therefore, as being concerned with the end of life rather than with the means and process of living, is necessarily opposite to science in subordinating doing to knowing or seeing; it can make no terms with pragmatism. Such has always been the traditional teaching of the Christian Church. 'God saw all that He had made, and, behold, it was very good.' And He created man in His own image so that ultimately, in his tiny measure, man might share the vision. The vision of God and of the world in God has constantly been placed before the Christian soul as the highest and farthest goal of its aspiration. It is a very unfashionable doctrine nowadays to make contemplation the end of action. It is inevitable that this should be so in a scientific age, which is characteristically interested in mechanism and process, and finds the very notion of finality repugnant. But religion, while it confesses that we are pilgrims and sojourners here below, resolutely rejects the veiled scepticism of the doctrine that 'it is better to travel hopefully than to arrive.' All St. Paul's deepest and loftiest prayers are directed to asking that his converts may know fully and understand the love of God in Christ; and St. John speaks of the final heaven as that world in which 'we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.' Here on earth we have faith, not vision, to live by; and faith, being 'the substance of

things hoped for,' is necessarily temporal, directing our forward journey towards that which we see not yet. For faith, action comes before knowledge in the immediate order of importance. And yet ultimately even this world can only be changed and recreated in the heavenly image by those who believe that the God of love is the eternal truth of the universe, and that the goal of all endeavour is that He should be fully manifested and expressed in all. It is the longing to see Him as He is, which is the religious, and therefore the most real, motive for abolishing slums. If this be so, we must record our agreement with A. E. Taylor, K. E. Kirk, and the upholders of the Platonic tradition in Christian theology, against brilliant modernist writers, like Macmurray, who, in appearing to reject the distinction between theory and practice, comes perilously near to a pragmatism which destroys the meaning of truth.<sup>1</sup>

There will always inevitably be tension and opposition between the activities of religion and of science. Science will always be throwing fresh light on the mechanism of the world; and its discoveries will constantly be hard to harmonize with the religious interpretation of the whole. The more science analyses the parts, the more difficult it will be perhaps to fit them altogether again in any intelligible unity. Yet it is by loyally facing and grappling with the difficulties that religion really learns the truth of God, and verifies the faith that all things work together for good for them that love Him.

<sup>1</sup> See his *Freedom in the Modern World* (Faber), and his essay in *Adventure*, ed. by Streeter (Macmillan).

## Missionary Problems of To-day.

### II.

#### Swaraj in the Mission Field.

BY PROFESSOR THE REVEREND J. F. MCFADYEN, D.D., NAGPUR.

In the early days of a Mission the missionary regards it as his chief work to try to win individual converts. At this stage he has one function only, that of a missionary. Soon he will associate some of his converts with himself in his missionary activities. If these are devoting the whole of their time to the work, they will receive a salary. Some-

times there is a secondary reason for engaging them, namely, to provide work for those whose Christian profession has excluded them from the ordinary means of earning a livelihood. Thus the missionary takes on a second function, that of an employer and paymaster. From the beginning the missionary and the converts will worship together;



when there is a reasonable number of Christians they will be formed into a congregation or *ecclesiola*. The missionary now assumes a third function, that of pastor of a congregation. At this stage, whatever form of church government may be adopted, or whatever designation may be given to the missionary, he is, for all practical purposes, a bishop, with or without clergy. The time that may elapse before one or more of the converts may be ordained to the pastorate will vary according to the local circumstances.

In the meantime other missionaries of the same denomination or of other denominations are at work in the same district or the same country; other congregations are being formed and other pastors ordained. Unless the missionary is one who adopts the congregational polity, he will wish to see his congregation or congregations organically related to a larger body of Christians. Historically the plan adopted was to make them part of the foreign church from which the missionary came. It is easy, looking back after the lapse of a long period, to criticise this policy; but at the time, with only tiny bodies of Christians scattered through a large country, with communications exceedingly difficult or non-existent, with denominational feeling running high and national sentiment much less strongly developed than it is now, it must have seemed the obvious policy.

During this stage a fourth development took place, the rise of missionary institutions. It was discovered that, while preaching was one method of conducting missionary propaganda, it was often a very unsatisfactory method; its chief weakness being the lack of a continuous impression and of systematic instruction. Humanitarian motives were also at work, the ignorance of the people calling for schools, and their sufferings and diseases appealing for hospitals and dispensaries. If the children of converts were to receive a Christian education, very often the only means of securing this was that the Mission should undertake the work. Further, it is difficult for a small community, especially if the educational standard is not high, to rise far above the moral and spiritual level of their neighbours. It was important that, besides aiming at the conversion of individuals, the Mission should seek to Christianize the social life of the community, their ideals, their customs, their standards, their whole outlook. For one reason or another, as time went on, hospitals and dispensaries, schools and colleges, hostels and boarding-schools for boys and for girls, institutions for training teachers, for training preachers and ministers, for

training industrial workers, orphanages, leper asylums, institutions for social work, and a printing press, became in greater or less degree an essential part of the equipment of Missions (though not all of each Mission). Thus the missionary assumed a fourth function, that of the head of an institution. Not all missionaries, of course, exercised all four functions, though some did.

Thus at the beginning of this century, speaking generally, the position was that Christian propaganda in non-Christian countries was entirely controlled by the foreign missionaries, working with the aid of native Christians whom they appointed and paid from Western funds; and that, while a certain degree of church organisation had been reached on the mission field, the ecclesiastical connexion was with churches in the West.

From the beginning the motto adopted by the Student Volunteer Missionary Union, 'The Evangelization of the World in this Generation' was the subject of criticism; but perhaps the most fundamental objection to which it was liable was that it envisaged the evangelization of the world as the work of foreign missionaries. Even yet, it is by no means generally realized that the work of the foreign mission is to plant a seed, not to develop a full-grown tree. If the seed has life in itself, then it will grow, as it has grown in the countries of Europe. As long ago as 1851 Henry Venn foresaw the time when missionaries would be able to resign their pastoral work into the hands of native pastors, when the *euthanasia* of the mission would take place, and the missionary and his agencies be transferred to the 'regions beyond.'

About the beginning of this century it was recognized as anomalous that large bodies of Christians, especially in the Orient, should be members of churches in countries which they had never seen and were never likely to see. This century has been the period of the foundation of indigenous churches in the Mission field. A generation ago, most of the Presbyterian churches in India united to form one Indian Presbyterian Church; though, not long afterwards, the Southern section left this union to take part in a much larger union which affected South India only, a union on a much broader basis. The scheme for the proposed Union of the South India United Church, the Wesleyan Church, and the Anglican Church has attracted wide attention, and the negotiations are proceeding amicably if slowly. There is also a scheme on foot, probably not to be based, like the South Indian scheme, on the 'historic episcopate,' for a union between the North India United Church



(a union of Presbyterians and Congregationalists), the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Baptists, and possibly the Disciples of Christ, the Friends, and the Anglicans. The 1932 decennial survey of the *International Review of Missions* states that 'the desire for church union found expression in the formation of the Church of Christ in China, in 1927, from some fourteen missions and Churches, chiefly Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist. To-day this Church comprises from one quarter to one-third of the total Protestant Christian community.' In Japan, while something has been accomplished, progress towards church union has been 'disappointingly slow.'

In those cases where the severance of the mission church from the home church involved the stoppage of pecuniary help, it seems to have been a case of putting the cart before the horse. Surely the wise policy would have been to continue for a time to supply funds which would have made possible the appointment of native pastors with some education who might have gradually led their congregations to financial independence, rather than to condemn congregations to the stagnation that arises when the pastor has no capacity for leadership.

One powerful influence at work during the last generation in the churches in mission lands has been the unwillingness of Christian nationals to have imposed upon them systems of theology and forms of church government which their ancestors had no part in framing, and which may not accord with the national genius. Most of these churches have not yet had time or opportunity to develop their own dissensions, and the formation of a national, all-embracing Christian Church seems to many of them easier than it is. Yet we must not assume that the desire for such a Church, at least at this stage, is universal. Thus in 1921 the Christo-Samaj (Christian Union) of India presented a memorandum to Mr. J. H. Oldham in which they expressed their entire disapproval of the proposal 'for the formation of a centralized single ecclesiastical organization comprehending the entire Christian community.' They were afraid it would mean the continuation of close organization and costly institutions, the perpetuation of administrative and financial dependence on foreign missions, and the replacement of the white bureaucracy by a brown bureaucracy.' The 'one church' ideal has many votaries nevertheless.

The missionary, no less than the political, world is increasingly dominated by the nationalist obsession; and this fact has to be kept in mind throughout the entire discussion. One has heard

an educated Indian Christian say, in an audience composed chiefly of Hindus, that he hoped the day would come when they would meet, not as Hindus and Muhammadans and Christians, but simply as Indians. The Apostle Paul seems to have been more anxious that his converts in Corinth should be good Christians than that they should be good Greeks; but tremendous emphasis is now placed on nationality, not only by native Christians, but even by missionaries and by Mission Boards. It is regarded as a very serious matter to have a missionary institution that may be described as 'foreign,' or to be accused of 'denationalizing' the natives. One would hope the day will come when the present state of things, curiously reminiscent of the 'foreign devil' psychology, will pass and people of different nationalities will be able to work together simply as Christians. The regime in which we defer to and even encourage nationalist sentiment is at least an advance on the earlier stage in which the European and American, simply on account of their white faces, had almost a monopoly of privilege and power.

Almost from the beginning, then, there were the two institutions, the Mission and the Church; but till the end of the nineteenth century, the relations between them could hardly be said to constitute a problem. The native churches, while never losing sight of the duty of evangelizing the people in their neighbourhood, were regarded, and regarded themselves, as mainly responsible for fostering the spiritual life of their own members. The propaganda work was mainly the concern of the Missions, with their elaborate and often expensive institutions. As the twentieth century advanced, grave dissatisfaction developed with the position that had been established.

On the one hand, the missionaries felt that while the day of their withdrawal from the mission field was hardly anywhere in sight, yet it was part of their business to furnish native Christian leaders with opportunities for acquiring the experience and administrative capacity that would enable the Church ultimately to undertake the work formerly done by the Mission. On the other hand, the members of the new churches realized that it was at once their duty and their privilege to carry the gospel to their own countrymen; and that they could not, without loss of self-respect, continue to allow that duty to be discharged almost entirely by men and women from other lands. More than a quarter century ago, Indian Christians founded the National Missionary Society for the evangelization of their countrymen; and to that and similar



societies in the year 1931 they contributed about £18,000. There were various other ways in which the Indian churches might have taken a large and important part in the evangelization of India, quite apart from the work done by Missions; but what the Christians wanted, at least in the intellectually more advanced countries, was the end of the sharp separation between Mission and Church.

As a matter of fact, there was something to be said for this separation, at least in a country like India in which there was British rule and the white man's prestige was high. The Mission was a temporary and foreign institution; the Church was permanent and indigenous. There was urgent need that the Church, its organizations, and its officials should take a higher place in the respect and affection of the Christians. But so long as membership and office in the Mission Councils with their prestige were open to Indians, there was grave fear that the Indian goal would be position in the Mission Council rather than in the Church. That fear has proved to be by no means unfounded. But all over the East the continued separation of Mission and Church was regarded as a product of race feeling, and in large measure the point has been yielded.

If the wall of partition between Church and Mission had to be broken down, what, then, were to be the relations between them? Where there is a strong indigenous Church, deeply imbued with Christian ideals, and with a fair number of educated and level-headed leaders, perhaps the ideal is that the Mission should, as far as possible, be merged in the Church. This plan seems to have worked well, so far, in Manchuria for example, the missionaries there receiving their locations from the Chinese Church. For a long time past in the American Methodist Episcopal Church Missions, there has been, in theory at least, no vital separation between Church and Mission. But most Missions have not found themselves in a position to take a step so far-reaching; and for the last dozen years attention has, for the most part, been concentrated on schemes of Devolution—the gradual transference of control from the Mission to the indigenous Church, involving incidentally the training of native leaders for the new responsibilities. In 1922, for example, 'the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions passed over all its evangelistic work to a Japanese Church Board, on which were only four missionary representatives.' In January 1930 'the (Egyptian) Church took over from the C.M.S. its literary, social, and evangelistic work.' 'The

various Anglican Missions working in India, though rapidly being merged in these Diocesan Councils' (1928), 'co-operate in the work of the Church by placing at the disposal of the Diocesan Councils, which have a predominant Indian membership, their contributions in men and money.' These statements may be taken as typical of the new spirit. India has now, in the Anglican Church, an Indian bishop and an Indian assistant bishop, while there is an Indian bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Christian nationals have also a very large representation on the National Missionary Councils which have been established almost everywhere during the last decade and which are rapidly acquiring prestige and influence.

There has been much discussion of the financial aspect of Devolution Schemes. Church members in the West were willing to allow the missionaries of their own Church to have the disbursement of the money they raised for foreign missions. It was doubted whether they would be equally willing to leave the disposal of these funds in the hands of members of the Church of another country. The question does not seem anywhere to have arisen in an acute form. For one thing, it may be assumed that the Missions have everywhere reserved sufficient representation on the new Boards to be accurately informed of the way in which the money that comes from home is being used. As for the general principle, there is in Western countries a very large number of parishes which could not by themselves have supported a minister, and which feel it no indignity to receive financial support for the purpose from the State, or from stronger churches in other parts of their own land. May we not extend the principle? The Mission churches are asking this financial aid, or at least receiving this financial aid, not for the support of their own pastors, but to help in bringing the gospel to their countrymen.

A matter of great importance is the way in which the grant from the home Church to the native Church is fixed. It would be very easy to give the grant in a way which would not bring home to the nationals their responsibility, and would not stimulate the liberality of the indigenous Church. A plan which has found much favour is the 'block' grant progressively diminishing. Ultimately, however, the sense of responsibility felt by the members of any Church for the welfare of their countrymen, and their willingness to work, to sacrifice and to give that the reign of Christ may spread, will not depend on regulations made by any Board in their own land or in another



land. As was pointed out long ago, swaraj is a thing of the spirit, and the ultimate test of its worth is the contribution it makes to the understanding of the Christ, and to the winning of the world for Him.

The transference of responsibility from the home churches to the indigenous churches has been a comparatively simple matter in connexion with some branches of the work, such as bazaar preaching and primary schools. The chief questions which await solution in that department are financial. What period of time must elapse before the indigenous churches are able and willing to provide the whole of the funds required? If that period seems likely to be lengthy, how long will the churches of the West be willing to finance work which they only in a very minor degree control? These are questions which only the future can answer.

The institutions such as Arts and Science Colleges, Training Colleges, Theological Colleges, High Schools, Hostels, and Hospitals, will present a bigger problem, with regard alike to administration, personnel, and finance. The Lindsay Commission has made proposals for giving Indians a much larger share in the government of the Mission Colleges in India than has been customary hitherto; but at the speed at which things are moving, there seems good reason to hope that, within a measurable time, at least in the more advanced countries, Christian nationals will be able to undertake a very large share both of the work and of the administration. There is already in India (at Alwaye) a College conducted entirely by Indian Christians. Finance may prove a stiffer problem; but, curiously enough, in some of these large institutions, the financial difficulty may turn out to be more easily soluble than would appear on a superficial view. Fees and Government grants bring in so large an

income that even now a very expensive college may make no demand on the Home Board except for the salaries of the foreign staff, and for only a portion even of that amount. The same is true of hospital work. If Christian nationals of adequate attainments can be found, as doubtless they can, who will be content with a subsistence allowance, in some cases at least the question of funds need present no insuperable obstacle to the transference of these institutions also. Further, we have to keep in mind the point of view presented by the Indian Christo-Samaj. When the young churches develop a fuller self-consciousness, they may favour quite different methods of spreading the gospel from those used by the Western churches with their passion for organization. Even if they do not disapprove of institutions as a missionary method, they may decide that these have had their day. In so far as Hospitals, Schools, and Colleges exist for the benefit of the Christian communities, there is even now in many cases the option of Government institutions not intended primarily for Christians. It will be for the indigenous churches to say how far these meet their needs.

Speculation on the future development of the new churches, and especially of these churches as agencies for the spread of the gospel, is not at this stage very profitable. The story of the past generation contains much that is reassuring; and with the mutual good-will that is being displayed, and the readiness which missionaries are almost everywhere showing to surrender for the good of the Church power and privileges which they have long held, there is good reason to look forward with hope and confidence to the developments that will take place in the new and most interesting era in the history of Missions on which we have already entered.

## Literature.

### WHITHER ISLAM?

ALIKE for political and religious reasons, the movements that are taking place to-day in Islamic countries cannot fail to be of the profoundest interest to any one who bestows any thought on the immediate or the remoter future of the world. To clarify the situation, Professor H. A. R. Gibb, of London, has issued a book with the above

title (Gollancz; 15s. net), which consists of four contributions to the problem from writers, all of whom speak with authority, and two masterly essays by Professor Gibb himself. Professor Massignou, of Paris, writes on Africa (excluding Egypt), Professor Kampffmeyer on Egypt and Western Asia, Lieut.-Col. Ferrar on India, and Professor C. C. Berg on Indonesia.

There is a real solidarity of culture and tradition



throughout the Islamic world, but this has been so profoundly affected by the impact of European culture and European methods of scientific thought that the necessity for a readjustment is being increasingly felt—a tendency most markedly evident, perhaps, in Egypt. This 'westernization' of Islam is to be seen in many directions, in the altering status of women, in education, and, above all, in the rapid rise and extension of journalism, which is described as 'far and away the most revolutionary and influential of all the contributions of Europe to the Moslem world.' As a religion Islam has lost little of its force; but in the more advanced countries the interests of the Moslem are no longer bounded by religion, and Islam, as the arbiter of social life, is being dethroned. But even the religion has not remained unaffected; in every Moslem country there are movements towards a reinterpretation or revision of the doctrines of Islam. And it is interesting to learn that, while the Moslems bitterly resent missionary attacks on Islam, relations between the bodies can in other respects be so friendly that the Greek Orthodox Congress in Palestine actually sent greetings to the Islamic Congress, which happened to be meeting at the same time. It is also refreshing to hear of institutions like the Young Men's Moslem Association, to most of whose tenets, which have to do mainly with the promotion of the moral life, the most devoted Christian could subscribe with alacrity.

This book, which deals with the inner currents of thought among the Moslem peoples rather than with the political situation, finely interprets not only the present crisis in Islam, but also the crucial importance of Islam. For 'in its hands,' as Professor Gibb strikingly says, 'lies very largely the solution of the problem with which Europe is faced in its relations with the East. If ever the opposition of the great societies of the East and the West is to be replaced by co-operation, the mediation of Islam is an indispensable condition.'

#### THE GOSPEL IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

*The Gospel in the Early Church* (Longmans; 16s. net) is a study of the early development of Christian thought by James Mackinnon, Ph.D., D.D., D.Th., LL.D., Professor-Emeritus of Ecclesiastical History, University of Edinburgh. Dr. Mackinnon was already well known as historian of 'Modern Liberty,' of 'Scottish Social and Industrial History,' of 'Scottish Constitutional History,' and of 'Luther and the Reformation' when two years

ago, with the issue of his work on 'The Historic Jesus,' he revealed himself in the unexpected rôle of historian of the Early Church. In that work he attempted to depict the gospel as it appears in the authentic record of Jesus' mission and teaching. And now he has published a continuation of it, in which he endeavours to trace the development of the gospel from the death of Jesus onward to, approximately, the middle of the second century, as this development is reflected in the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic writings, and in those of the early Fathers. Nor does it appear that Dr. Mackinnon's literary labours have ceased. Yet his is already a conspicuous record of literary achievement, as distinguished as it is many-sided.

The term 'gospel' is here used as equivalent to Christianity, in its early form, as a proclamation or teaching which centres in Jesus Christ, the Revealer of God, and the divinely ordained Redeemer of mankind. Such other aspects of early Christianity as the Christian mission and the rise of the Christian Church as an organized institution are not considered. It is the Christian message rather than the Christian movement that is here reviewed.

In his presentation of the Christian message Dr. Mackinnon shows himself to be in the line of liberal Christianity. It is enough to cite his treatment of the question of the evidence for St. Paul's conception of the pre-existent, cosmic Christ. 'The cosmic Christ,' he concludes, 'is, after all, but an inference. Paul's grand preoccupation is the Cross of Christ, his significance and his achievement as the agent of man's redemption.' The selfsame liberal attitude appears throughout the volume, not only in the treatment of the Pauline Gospel, but also in the treatment of the Primitive Gospel, the Sub-Apostolic Gospel, and the Gospel in the early Fathers (Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Barnabas, Hermas, and the author of the 'Didache').

There appears to be room for such a monograph in English as this, which will further commend itself to many readers by reason of the sanity of its guidance and the freshness of its bibliographical notes.

#### THE TEXT OF ACTS.

Professor Albert C. Clark of Oxford has made a notable contribution to New Testament study in *The Acts of the Apostles: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes on Selected Passages* (Milford; 30s. net). The main portion consists of a printing



of the text with a very copious *apparatus criticus*. Professor Clark adopts a particular text and gives in the Introduction his reasons why. It is the so-called 'Western' text. For some considerable time back, scholars have become more and more convinced that the term 'Western' is not only dubious but erroneous. It is one care of Professor Clark to demonstrate that; and for the misleading 'Western' he suggests simply the symbol Z. He suggests strongly that Z was Eastern in origin, and proves that, whatever its origin, it was in very widespread use till the imposing group of MSS which were used by the Revisers of the English New Testament displaced it. As to Acts, our readers are aware that the Z text is longer, containing numerous additions, chiefly of realistic detail, to the familiar narrative. The prevailing view has been that such extra matter represents interpolations into, and embellishments of, what was the normal text. Professor Clark takes the opposite view. Z, he holds, was originally the normal, and its rival was produced by way of abbreviation, sometimes accidental, but for the most part deliberate. We feel that in this Professor Clark has proved his case.

Why the text should have been abbreviated is a difficult question. Still more difficult is it to understand why the Church should have so generally adopted the abbreviated text as the standard. Professor Clark has suggestions to make as to both points which strike us as very reasonable. But whether one agrees with him here or not, it may be said that he is not bound to answer such questions. The prime question is as to the facts, and the view set forth in this volume will not, we think, be easily contradicted, or even essentially modified.

### THEOLOGY AND DEVOTION.

Books of devotion are not usually characterized by strenuous thinking. The writers are generally content with sweet meditations and appeals to the emotions. And a little of them goes a long way. Even à Kempis can be cloying if taken in too large amounts. Besides, books of devotion are usually on severely traditional lines. It seems to be assumed that only the old theology can elicit and direct devotional feeling. Both these ideas are set at naught in *Seven Words*, by the Rev. W. R. Matthews, D.D., Dean of Exeter (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). Dr. Matthews is known everywhere as one of the ablest and most independent thinkers in the Church of England, or in

any Church for that matter, and we owe him much for the apologetic works in which he has vindicated the truth of Christianity in face of the present-day challenge.

A book of devotion from Dr. Matthews is very welcome, not only for itself, but as a proof that the 'liberal' interpretation of the gospel has a real religious message. The weakness of Modernism generally has been its spiritual barrenness. Dr. Matthew's book, however, shows that this is not a necessary result of enlightened 'breadth.' The book is marked by all the writer's qualities, virile thinking, originality, and simplicity. The aim is to show that each of the seven words from the Cross has light for us on a fundamental problem of our common life, and in the exposition there is no straining after artificial applications. The Lord's words are allowed to give their message in a natural reference to some of the most pressing needs of our day. And one rises from the absorbed reading of these pages refreshed and strengthened with real and living bread.

### FROM TERTULLIAN TO ERASMUS.

The welcome which was universally accorded to the first volume of Dr. McGiffert's *History of Christian Thought* will certainly be extended to the second (Scribner's; 12s. 6d. net). The period covered is that from Tertullian to Erasmus (in the West), and every name of importance is considered—some at great length, like Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. By a skilful interweaving of biographical and historical touches into his theological discussion Dr. McGiffert has contrived to invest with vivid interest a subject which, in the hands of some of his predecessors, has been insufferably dull, and even in the minds of non-theological readers he can kindle an interest in the theological discussion itself. Here we may see the rise and development of ideas which have profoundly affected the course of history, such as the infallibility of the Church and the political claims of the papacy; while as early as Lactantius we find ringing declarations against the illegitimacy of war.

A fine critical spirit pervades the discussion. The greatness of the great men is amply recognized, but their weaknesses are not ignored. Dr. McGiffert's recognition of the profound religious genius of Augustine, for example, and of his enormous influence on the subsequent history of the Church, does not blind him to the fact that he did much to hinder the development of science during the Middle Ages, or to the other fact that

his polemic as a rule was bitter and unfair, and that he often caricatured his opponents in scandalous fashion; nor, in his appreciation of Jerome as a very great scholar and littérateur, does he omit to mention that some of his polemical treatises betray not only a deplorable failure to understand the theological issues involved, but an uncommon power of invective and a singular lack of conscience: and Bernard of Clairvaux, we are told, for all his praise of love, was a violent hater. Some of the less well-known figures are singularly attractive to the modern mind—Jovinian, with his opposition to monasticism, Pelagius, who looked askance at penance as tending to encourage a too easy yielding to sin, and Abelard, with his insistence on the application of reason to the doctrines of the Christian system. Dr. McGiffert has a great admiration for John Scotus Erigena, whose system 'for sweep of imagination and breadth of vision has seldom been surpassed in ancient or modern times,' and he gives a clear account of Thomas's not entirely consistent synthesis of Aristotelian philosophy and Christian theology. We are glad to note his sympathetic account of Erasmus and his rejection of the idea that he was a coward and a time-server. This book must lead to a fresh appreciation of the Middle Ages, marked as they were by uncommon intellectual activity, and by an 'originality and creativeness, a freshness and variety' which have too often been denied to them by those who have not taken the trouble to make the acquaintance of their great writers, thinkers, and saints.

#### DEMOCRACY IN CRISIS.

Many are the attacks which are made on democracy at the present time, and in his *Democracy in Crisis* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) Professor Harold J. Laski, who holds the Chair of Political Science in the University of London, continues the relentless criticism. He gives a sombre picture of the present situation, but feels that he is compelled to do so by the facts of the case. Our present position is insecure, and he believes that our feet are nearer the abyss than we are willing to acknowledge. We must, therefore, 're-examine the basis of our institutional habits if we are to find the formulæ of a new world.'

Democracy has not failed; it has not really been tried. There is a constant contradiction and antagonism between political and economic power. The former is theoretical and ostensibly based on equality, but the latter is practical and actually

concentrated in the hands of the few. The legislature and the law-courts are supporters of the *status quo*. Attempts at adjustment to the demands of the people have hitherto taken the form of concessions, but concessions, especially if reluctantly granted, are always regarded as mainly a tribute to the power of those who profit by them, and are, therefore, productive of unceasing further demands.

Moreover, concessions are possible only in times of national economic prosperity, and if, in times of depression, the social services have to be restricted, the tension between capitalists and the rest of society immediately becomes acute. Liberty and equality must always go together; liberty divorced from equality is quickly seen to degenerate into special privileges for the capitalist.

Professor Laski hopes, almost against hope, that the solution of our present difficulties may come by constitutional means, but he sees many obstacles in the way of a socialist majority making its will effective, and he is afraid that the present holders of power will use irregular means to preserve their privileges, thus goading their opponents into revolutionary action. He regards as almost complete the 'inability of the comfortable to enter into the minds and feelings of those who lack the benefits of their position,' but he thinks that even a miracle may happen, and he is not without confidence that the socialist party may even yet give reasonable consideration to the established expectations of vested interests, and thus avoid the abruptness which chiefly endangers their success in the minds of those who have the experience and temperament of the British people. Professor Laski's style is far from clear, and he takes astonishing liberties with both language and grammar, but he gets down to fundamentals, as is shown by the adaptability of his generalizations to other countries than those which he has under immediate consideration.

A sensible and helpful book of apologetic has been written by the Dean of Drew University, Dr. Frank G. Lankard, *Difficulties in Religious Thinking* (Abingdon Press; \$2.00). Dr. Lankard has had a wide and varied academic experience, and is well versed in the mentality of the youth of to-day and of America. He thinks the difficulties of religious belief are acute for men about nineteen years of age, and for women (curiously) not till twenty-three. This judgment is based on a kind of questionnaire initiated by himself. In any case the author knows his constituency, and



writes here for it admirably. The big questions are all handled, and for the most part satisfactorily. The chapter on the Bible is excellent. That on Jesus suffers a little from vagueness, as most of such books do. The conclusion is a sort of reverence for a 'divine' Person, using the word 'divine' somewhat loosely. The general effect of the whole book, however, is sound, and it will make a special appeal to young men and women who are perplexed about religious truth.

In *Religion and the Good Life* (Abingdon Press; \$2.00), Professor W. Clayton Bower discusses 'how religion may function effectively in the formation of character.' He has much to say about the technique of the religious and moral life, about the contributions of psychology and sociology to the analysis of beliefs and motives, and such like topics. Much of this is very excellent, yet the reader is left with a feeling that there is here much beating of the air. The standpoint is frankly humanistic. God is no more than a concept, and if that be so it may be doubted whether men will continue the practice of prayer and of 'participation in the religious group' in order to cultivate the sense of being 'at home in the universe.' If religion has nothing more real and potent to offer than this, then we may as well build with Bertrand Russell on the bed-rock of 'invincible despair.'

As a personal religious testimony *When Half-Gods Go*, by the Rev. Frank Kingdon, D.D. (Abingdon Press; \$1.50), is impressive and valuable. It contains the message which a preacher has to give after twenty years in the ministry. God comes to every man by private doors, the writer says, and here we find the doors by which He has become real to one deeply religious soul. No witness of such a kind can ever fail to 'find' readers, and these chapters sound a note of honesty that will awaken an echo in other souls.

A good man faced with a particular situation will act in an almost predictable way, whether he profess to follow Kant, Mill, Green, or Spencer; he will feel the same about a crime in others or a lapse of his own, whether he be a determinist or a libertarian. Why? Probably because any type of ethical theory contains some truth, but none of the historical theories has the whole truth, and in real life the good man is moved by many more considerations than, in theory, he holds to be sufficient. In *Moral Laws* (Abingdon Press; \$2.50) Professor Edgar S. Brightman of Boston

gives us a new text-book of Ethics. It does exceedingly well some things that former text-books have done—for example, in stating accurately and evaluating with discrimination various theories, and in clearing up the relationship of Ethics to Metaphysics, Æsthetics and Religion. What is new is the attempt to exhibit and justify at the bar of reason and experience the largish number of considerations that ought to be kept in view as one is faced with any real situation which calls for moral choice. The criterion of right action is not a single, dubious consideration such as 'greatest happiness of greatest number,' or 'possibility of universalizing,' or 'self-realization.' No fewer than eleven laws must receive due consideration—two formal, six axiological, and three personalistic. We refrain from specifying the laws. We wish readers to find them for themselves from the book, which strikes us as one of the most suggestive and helpful text-books to Ethics that we know.

What primitive sources lie behind our Gospels? Streeter's work was epoch-marking, and since then various modifications have been suggested. We cordially commend to all interested *The Growth of the Gospels*, by Mr. Frederick C. Grant, Dean of Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill. (Abingdon Press; \$1.50). It is an interesting and illuminative discussion, thoroughly abreast of the most recent study. It will be of great value to the student, who is instructed how to mark his Greek text so that Ur-Mark, Q, L, and M stand out distinctly. Whether one agrees with the writer on every point or not is not important; an admirable work is here presented which can scarcely be praised too highly.

The Rev. W. Wilson Cash, who writes so interestingly on Missions, has issued a little book of *Helps to the Study of Philipians* (C.M.S.; 1s.). The exposition is centred round the theme of fellowship, on which there are twenty-five brief studies. One is inclined to look critically on a commentary in which one idea is made dominant, but here there is no forcing in the interpretation of the text. The thought of the Epistle is unfolded in a natural way, with scholarly care and rich Christian feeling. This little book would form an excellent guide for a study circle.

*Christian Science and the Christian Faith*, by the Rev. Breenes Miller (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), contains four sermons in which the writer, while acknowledging the wide influence of Christian

science, criticises its doctrines and practices. At the same time he sets forth the true Christian teaching in regard to the possibilities of spiritual healing. The exposition is clear and deals in a simple way with just those difficulties that are apt to trouble the man in the pew.

*The Morals of the Scottish Clergy*, vol. i. 'Before the Reformation' (Gardner, Paisley; 5s. net), may be followed by other volumes dealing with the subsequent periods. The author is the Rev. William Watson, D.D., D.Litt., Minister at Oyne, Aberdeenshire, well known in the Church of Scotland as a versatile scholar. In this volume the attempt has been made as far as possible to reach evidence contemporary with the lives and actions of the men whose virtues and vices are recorded. Apparently, to avoid adding to the price of the volume, the references to the authorities are not given. The scheme is simple. In the first part of the volume, dealing with the period from St. Ninian to the coming of Queen Margaret, the material is arranged under the rubrics of beneficence, self-control, lack of self-control, zeal, lack of zeal; in the second part, dealing with the period from Queen Margaret to the Reformation, it is again arranged under the self-same rubrics. The work is written in a clear and popular style and abounds in interesting detail. Obviously Dr. Watson has a wide and intimate knowledge of Scottish history, and he is successful in presenting his material in its historical setting. He does not appear to be troubled with critical doubts concerning the historical value of some of the records of the earlier period.

That excellent series, 'The Westminster Books,' whose aim is to treat practical problems in untechnical language, continues to maintain its high standard of usefulness. Two volumes have come to hand. The first is entitled *Does Science leave Room for God?*, by the Rev. R. O. P. Taylor, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. net). It deals with many of the difficulties that have been raised in the popular mind by the diffusion of scientific knowledge. Among the topics treated are 'The Creator,' 'The Lawgiver,' 'The Merciful Father,' 'The Incarnate Logos,' and 'The Marks of the Spirit.' The reasoning is lucid, the style simple, the shafts of criticism acute and often barbed with delightful wit. Take this on miracle and law. 'It is well to remember sometimes that thinking was not invented in the nineteenth century. There is no need to assume that the Jew could not see the implications of his creed. No doubt he looked at

things differently. It is true he was not interested to know how God worked His miracles, whereas we are greatly interested. But he would never dream that God had changed from a law-maker to a law-breaker, even on those strange occasions. I have heard Christian people defend the idea that miracles are a reversal of natural law by saying, "God can do as He likes." But I have no doubt that the Jew would rejoin, "The likings of God cannot alter."'

The second is *What Did Jesus Teach?* by Professor J. Alexander Findlay, D.D. (3s. net). After a preliminary chapter on the trustworthiness of the Gospels, Dr. Findlay deals with the teaching of Jesus about God, about the individual, about the social life of man, and about Himself. The chapter on social life is especially full and thought-provoking. To many it will appear revolutionary, for Professor Findlay writes as a Christian Communist. 'There is not a shred of evidence that Jesus ever made the separation between "spiritual" and "material" that we commonly make. He never used the word "spiritual" at all, and in His institution of the Last Supper He quite definitely suggested that we shall never enter into communion with God until we are ready to share what we call the material things of life with one another.' The whole book deserves to be read and pondered.

Any one who desires a popular and persuasive presentation of the modernist creed will find it in *Faith without Fear*, by the Rev. T. Rhondda Williams, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). The writer is deeply in earnest in striving to interpret and commend the gospel, as he understands it, to the mind of to-day. He has much to say that is wise, beautiful, and devout. His reverence for Jesus Christ is deep and passionate. But he finds no value in much that is dear to Christian hearts. He quotes with approval the words of Dr. Kirsopp Lake that 'the modern man does not believe in any form of salvation known to ancient Christianity.' Redemption is when a man comes 'into the realisation that the whole world, including himself, is one in God.' Again, 'it was a wrong theology that made Job cry out for a mediator.' Dr. Fosdick in a foreword says of the writer, 'He is a Christian with the consent of all his faculties.' Karl Barth would doubtless roundly declare that his system of thought is essentially a negation of the gospel.

It is with some apprehension one opens a book with the title *Adventures of the White Girl in her Search for God*, by Mr. C. H. Maxwell (Lutterworth



Press; 1s. net). It is so obviously a reply to Mr. Shaw's 'The Adventures of the Black Girl in her Search for God.' And one fears that, if the author follows Mr. Shaw's method as well as his title, the result in unskilful hands may be anything but successful. This apprehension, however, is allayed by the modesty of the writer. He does not attempt to be 'clever.' He does not ape Mr. Shaw's violence or tricks. In the 'Black Girl,' as in all Mr. Shaw's writing, we are impressed alternately with the vivid truth and the almost incredible absurdity of many of the statements. The truth behind Mr. Shaw's extravaganzas is the Progressiveness of Revelation, and to a mind enlightened with this sane and reasonable view of Scripture the 'Black Girl' is simply a wild *tour de force* of misrepresentation. But the solid truth is behind it all, and it is this truth that Mr. Maxwell very simply and effectively brings out. His little book can do nothing but good. Indeed, it may bring illumination to many minds, with a light that is very much needed by both orthodox and heterodox. It is regrettable that in an otherwise excellent argument the author has allowed himself to sneer at Mr. Shaw's motives in writing this and other volumes.

*A Study of Jesus' Own Religion*, by Mr. George Walter Fiske (Macmillan; 10s. net), is a vigorous and arresting book written from the modernist standpoint. 'The book is a quest for the most characteristic conceptions and social ideals of this outstanding genius, this spiritual revolutionist of Galilee.' The writer has no sympathy with the apocalyptic element in the Gospels. The Kingdom of God becomes in his view 'the oncoming strides of the democracy of God.' There is a great deal of excellent sociology with special reference to the conditions of American social life. The picture of Jesus the social reformer and the human teacher, 'with keen mental acumen,' as skilful in answering questions 'as a Philadelphia lawyer,' is painted with vividness and colour. The application of the golden rule to family life, industrial, social, and international life, is worked out with conviction and power. Yet one is left with the disquieting question, Is this all? In 'the grand strategy of social evolution' is there the potency of world redemption?

Expectations are aroused, and disappointed, by the title of Dr. J. C. Carlile's book, *Portraits of Jesus* (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d. net). We turn eagerly to its pages to hear about the true representations of Jesus in art. But the sub-title undeceives us—

'Drawn by Himself.' The book is, in fact, a series of 'pictures' from the Gospels—'The Doctor of Souls,' 'The Good Shepherd,' 'The Friend of Little Children,' and others. The discourses are all happy and helpful. The book is brightened by a number of sketches by Harold Copping. Of these the frontispiece, a face of Jesus, is so good that the book is worth buying for it alone. It is one of the most impressive presentations of Jesus we have seen in art.

The merit of Dr. C. de Lisle Shortt's *The Influence of Philosophy on the Mind of Tertullian* (Stock; 4s. 6d. net) lies in its collocation of passages from the writings of Tertullian, which constitutes the demonstration of what is perfectly well known, namely, that the theological pioneer but notorious 'special pleader' of Carthage owed a great deal to philosophic studies which he sometimes affected to despise. Otherwise the book is marred by otiose repetitions and a disjointedness which sometimes produces incoherence.

A vigorous essay on the prospects of international comity has been written by Mr. Edward Shillito, M.A.—*Nationalism: Man's Other Religion* (S.C.M. 4s., in paper covers 2s. 6d.). The author emphasizes the fact that nationalism is a real religion, and a dangerous one. He points to nationalist movements in India, Japan, China, and Europe, in all of which lie the seeds of war. War is inevitable in a world organized into States that do not recognize anything above the ends of the State. The true internationalism will come through a Church which is first of all *Catholic* in the true sense, and *free*. In this way, and in this alone, the nations will be led back to the New Testament. The interest of the book is increased by sketches of the career of men like Marx, Machiavelli, Tilak, Sun Yat Sen, and Augustine.

*With All Thy Mind*, by the Rev. Norman Goodall, M.A. (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), is a most excellent and timely book, designed to recall Christian minds to a fresh sense of the necessity and value of Christian doctrine. After an introductory chapter on Religion and Dogma the writer deals successively with the doctrine of the Cross, the Person of Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the Trinity. He concludes with an exposition of the relation of dogma to faith, life, and prayer. These addresses were originally 'given at one of the Swanwick Conferences of the Student Christian Movement in the summer of 1932,' and they are of an extremely

high order intellectually. Nothing could be more admirably fitted to restore in the student mind that respect for Christian dogma without which religion is apt to evaporate in vague and formless sentiment.

Mr. McEwan Lawson is known as the writer of certain very vivacious sermonettes 'and other curly tales for young and old.' His new book, *Is Christianity Done For?* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), gives us a further supply of the same appetizing provender. It contains over a score of short papers, some of which have already appeared in the 'London Evening News' and 'The Christian World.' In these the writer discourses with lively wit and wisdom on such themes as 'The Folly of the Foot-Rule,' 'New Spectacles,' 'Luck or Providence,' 'What does the Cross Mean?' and 'Over the Hills and Far Away.' There is no formal apologetic or systematic argumentation, but all is written from the Christian standpoint and abounds in suggestions that there are 'reasons and reasons' why a man should believe.

*Amicitia Corolla* (University of London Press; 10s. 6d. net) is a volume of essays presented to James Rendel Harris, D.Litt., on the occasion of his eightieth birthday. An excellent portrait of Rendel Harris forms the frontispiece. The editor, Herbert G. Wood, writes a dedicatory letter in which it is claimed that these studies, whether or not directly connected with themes that Dr. Rendel Harris has made peculiarly his own, all reflect in a measure his joy in discovery, his delight in extending the bounds of knowledge, and his belief in the duty of playing the long game and pursuing research into remote quarters that may not seem to be immediately important or likely to be fruitful.

The volume includes studies, appealing to the professional rather than the general reader, in the

fields of New Testament and Old Testament research, and also in the realms of Church history and classical literature. Some particular avenues in which, as Mr. Wood says, Dr. Rendel Harris has been the pathfinder are here further explored—the character of the Western Text, for example, the influence of Testimonies, and the ramifications of Twin-lore. There are twenty-two essays in all, and the writers are from America, Holland, and Germany as well as England, not to speak of Armenia. Perhaps the best-known among them, in Great Britain at any rate, are (taking them in the alphabetical order in which Mr. Wood has arranged them), J. Vernon Bartlet, Henry J. Cadbury, F. J. Foakes-Jackson, Robert S. Franks, Kirsopp Lake, Hans Lietzmann, and Theodore H. Robinson. There is a 'Homage' by Adolf Deissmann.

*Bewilderment and Faith*, by the Rev. F. E. England, Ph.D., B.D. (Williams & Norgate; 3s. net), is a clear and able exposition of the religious situation in our day, with some suggestions as to how it should be met. As is usual in such books, the diagnosis of the disease is fuller than the description of the remedy. The writer is persuaded that men and women are not feeling their need of grace and forgiveness 'because another need is more pressing and more clamant. What we all need to-day is the power to maintain our peace, our courage, our joy, in the face of all menaces; to meet life's uncertainties with an even confidence; to rise above anxiety.' This may be so. But obviously these are not new needs peculiar to our time, but are fundamental human needs which have pressed sore on every generation since history began, and perhaps the most wholesome thing that could happen would be that this generation, which imagines itself and its problems unique, should learn that after all it is a world of ordinary sinful men and women needing to be saved in the ordinary way.

## The Message of the Epistles.

### I Thessalonians.

By PROFESSOR W. F. HOWARD, M.A., D.D., HANDSWORTH COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM.

'TAKE three orthodox Christians, enlightened according to the standards of their time, in the fourth, the sixteenth, and the twentieth centuries respectively, I think you will find more profound differences of religion between them than between

a Methodist, a Catholic, a Freethinker, and even perhaps a well-educated Buddhist or Brahman at the present day, provided you take the most generally enlightened representative of each class.' So wrote Professor Gilbert Murray twenty years



ago. The reason given to support this highly disputable proposition is that men are far more profoundly influenced by their general environment than by religious creeds. In these a man merely states those articles which he feels he ought to assert positively against those who think differently. But his standards of thought and conduct, the practical beliefs on which he acts without question, are part of the general view of life which he shares with his contemporaries, and which has often but the smallest relation to the formal profession of his faith. Now there can be no question that the world of thought in which Paul and his converts lived is entirely foreign to the modern mind. Nowhere is this contrast of prevalent beliefs more startlingly obvious than in the Thessalonian Epistles with their shortened perspective. It is almost impossible for one who lives in this century to imagine himself living in a society in which conduct was seriously affected by the expectation of the approaching end of the world. But if we think of the bizarre speculations of Jewish apocalypticism as the determinative factor in the faith of an early Christian community, we are missing the true meaning of the force which gave to the preaching of Christ its conquering sway in the Mediterranean world. In that same chapter from which the quotation given above is taken, Professor Gilbert Murray makes this acknowledgment: 'It is strange to reflect, and it shows what queer stuff we humans are made of, that it was these obscure congregations, superstitious and over-emotional, mostly ignorant and often the prey of charlatans, who held the main road of advance towards the greatest religion of the western world.'

It is for us to try to find out what it is that links us by a common interest with those traders and dock-labourers, slaves and freedmen, Jews and Greeks, opulent citizens and women of honourable estate, who formed the earliest Christian community at Thessalonica.

There is a sense in which every letter of Paul's is an occasional writing, called forth by a local or temporary situation, or by the stress of a sudden and critical emergency. The main theme of such an epistle is not for us of primary importance. We listen for those diapason undertones, the groundwork of the apostolic faith. It is what is assumed and implied in every letter, rather than the laboured argument, that conveys to us what is most essential in the Christian gospel. It is certainly of the greatest historical interest to know what were the questions which agitated the minds of primitive converts, or what were the speculative pitfalls into

which their untutored minds blundered, or what were the peculiar moral perils against which recent recruits from paganism had to be continually warned. We may admire the dialectical skill with which the Apostle meets his Jewish antagonists on their chosen ground, we may recognize the sympathy that leads him to solve the perplexities of those simple hearts at Thessalonica by dwelling on the familiar figures of apocalyptic imagery. But these are not the things which give us kinship with Paul or with those men and women of a far distant age to whom these letters were first addressed.

First Thessalonians is probably the earliest extant letter written by Paul. When he wrote it, however, he was no novice, but a missionary of many years' experience. We can learn from it something of the way in which the earliest evangelists brought home the stupendous meaning of Jesus Christ to those who had sought with varying success to find religious reality in the ethical monotheism of the Jewish religion, or in the mystery cults of Hellenism, or in the austere precepts of the Stoic preachers of righteousness.

A community had been formed and, in spite of subtle and malignant persecution, was carrying on a social life of joyous fellowship in the name of Jesus Christ. The Thessalonian Church originated in a visit which Paul, together with Silas and Timothy, paid to the city in the course of his second missionary journey, when the good news was proclaimed, 'the word of the Lord.' This was no mere philosophy of life, however noble in conception or attractive in presentation. It was a personal revelation, energetic, vitalizing, self-authenticating. The apostolic preaching was marked by three 'notes'—power, holy enthusiasm, assurance (1<sup>5</sup>). The same 'notes' are found in the description which Luke, in the early chapters of Acts, gives of the effects of the primitive apostolic message. For if these qualities marked those through whom the good news was proclaimed, corresponding results appeared in those who received the Word. Paul here writes of the force, of the spiritual quality, of the inward conviction, of which he and Silas were conscious while delivering the Word entrusted to them. The emphasis in Acts is upon the supernatural effects of the Word when received, of the enthusiasm which animated the holy fellowship, and of the boldness in character and speech which stamped the members of the Christian society.

There are, therefore, three elements in the creation of that Divine society which we call the Church. First there is the living word of God.

Then there is the preacher, who is the active medium through which Divine truth is offered to the hearers. Finally there are the recipients who must accept and appropriate the word of life. 'And for this cause we also thank God without ceasing, that, when ye received from us the word of the message, even the word of God, ye accepted it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God, which also worketh in you that believe' (2<sup>13</sup>).

(a) The word of God is the self-communication of God. It is not only spoken by God, it also tells about God. Above all, it is the revelation of God in the life and words of Jesus Christ, in His death and resurrection (Ro 10<sup>8, 9</sup>). This 'word of the message' (2<sup>13</sup>; cf. He 4<sup>2, 12</sup>) is living and active, awakening conscience, and quickening spiritual desire and purpose. The revelation of the purpose of God in the Lord Jesus Christ who died and rose again was made that those who respond to the message should be delivered from the inevitable tragedy that awaits a Godless course of life, and be brought into fellowship with God (1<sup>10</sup> 5<sup>9, 10</sup>). (b) But preaching, as Phillips Brooks taught us, is 'the bringing of truth through personality.' Nowhere does Paul lay greater stress than in this letter upon the character of the preacher as the medium of the Divine message. 'Ye know what manner of men we shewed ourselves toward you for your sake. And ye became imitators of us, and of the Lord' (1<sup>5, 6</sup>). The message would have suffered grievous contamination if the messengers could be justly charged with delusion, impure motives, cunning, obsequiousness, flattery, avarice, self-seeking. They were gentle, affectionate, considerate towards their converts, imparting to them not only the gospel of God, but also their own souls (2<sup>3-10</sup>). In this way God had attested their fitness to be entrusted with the gospel (2<sup>4</sup>). If we are thoughtless enough to attribute this emphasis upon the apostolic character to egotism on the part of Paul, it is well to remember how in such a community as that at Thessalonica, as indeed on the mission field to-day, the religion of Christ is imparted by example as much as by instruction. 'Christianity is taught rather than taught,' as the Dean of St. Paul's is so fond of reminding us. (c) The revelation so conveyed by the apostolic messengers found lodgement in the hearts of men and wrought out its positive results in changed lives. It was no abstraction, it was not information about a life once lived but now past and over. It was *saving* truth (cf. 1 Co 15<sup>2</sup>). Upon receiving the word of life the Thessalonians turned from the unrealities of their past worship 'to serve a living and true

God' (1<sup>9</sup>), and began to 'walk worthily of God, who called them into his own kingdom and glory' (2<sup>12</sup>). The result was seen in the adoption of the way of life which the apostles showed them according to the pattern of the Incarnate Life, which they in turn set forth as an example to other Christian groups in Macedonia. The hall-mark of this religious reality was the joy inspired by the Holy Spirit.

Thus the group was formed, one of the innumerable cells which together form the Christian Church, the body of Christ. For however little we are told of the rites and constitution of the Ecclesia, we must not lose sight of the fact that it is 'the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ' to which the letter is addressed. It is perilous to argue from silence, so we must lay no stress upon the absence of any reference to baptism or eucharist. As this letter was written at the very time when Paul was founding the Church at Corinth, we may assume from such a passage as 1 Co 11<sup>23</sup> that the Lord's Supper was celebrated in accordance with the 'tradition' that Paul had received and handed on to his converts. There is abundant evidence in the Pauline Epistles that baptism was the normal rite of admission into the Church. That there was some kind of church government is clear from the appeal at the close of this letter, 'We beseech you, brethren, to know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you' (5<sup>12</sup>). But it is deeply significant that their title to respect is character and service, 'and to esteem them highly in love for their work's sake.' Even in the earliest and simplest of Paul's letters there is no thought of the solitary Christian. The word of God must be heard and accepted by the individual, but it is through the society that this opportunity is first given to him, and it is in that society that the Christian character is formed and must grow to maturity.

This distinctive character is mentioned at the very beginning of the letter. For here we first meet with the three qualities which, in a later letter (1 Co 13<sup>13</sup>), Paul was to twine together into a chaplet of Christian graces—the three abiding virtues of Faith, Hope, and Love. But they are not mere adornments of the Thessalonian Christians. They are energies of the redeemed life. 'Remembering without ceasing your work of faith and labour of love and endurance of hope' (1<sup>3</sup>). They are also regarded as the sure defence of the Christian character: 'putting on the breast-plate of faith and love; and for a helmet, the hope of salvation' (5<sup>8</sup>).

1. *Faith* is a term of such cardinal importance



in the Pauline theology, and more particularly in his dialectic throughout the Judaistic controversy, that we may well consider its use in this earliest occurrence in the Epistles of Paul, where controversy seems to be out of sight. The idea is inherited from the Old Testament, where the word (with its cognates) stands for an attitude of reliance upon the Divine character, a belief that God's word holds good. This leads to a steadfastness of purpose persisting through every threat and experience of adversity. Human faith was the correlative of the Divine faithfulness. Now for Paul religious faith received an immense reinforcement when he accepted Jesus as the Christ of God. Loyalty to a tradition passed into personal devotion. The very name of God was filled with a new meaning. The sense of awe which it evoked had not vanished, but it had lost its associations of servile fear, and had assumed the form of wondering adoration. Paul now writes of 'our God and Father' (<sup>1</sup>3 <sup>31</sup>). His status with God is that of sonship, and, though that word is not found in this Epistle, the Fatherhood of God is a leading thought throughout. All that the Lord Jesus has done is an expression of God's grace. Faith is the human response to the Divine initiative. It is the complete and grateful submission of the soul to the love of God made known in Jesus Christ. This faith is, of course, a sentiment. It is a complex of emotions, conceptions, interests, and desires. It is intensely personal, for its essential quality is found in a relationship of devotion on the part of the individual soul to the risen Christ. None the less it expresses itself in conduct. It is a faith that works. Whenever faith is reduced to a merely intellectual assent to propositions about religious truth, or to a sterile orthodoxy, it has manifestly lost that driving power which makes every letter of Paul's palpitate with a spiritual energy.

2. Even if the famous hymn in praise of *love* in a later letter had never been written the character of the Lord Jesus had left so deep a mark upon the heart of Paul that every epistle of his would still bear witness to the love of Christ that passeth knowledge. This had created a new standard of conduct and was the bond of Christian fellowship. 'But concerning love of the brethren ye have no need that one write unto you: for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another' (<sup>4</sup>9). Yet there are two dangers which always lie in wait for a community whose members are united by a common emotion and are animated by mutual interest. The group may easily degenerate into a clique. A selfish exclusiveness then banishes the

spirit of neighbourliness, and men give to a party what was meant for mankind. Against this inverted charity Paul directs his prayer: 'The Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men' (<sup>3</sup>12). Another peril is that love, degenerating into an easy-going sentimentality, should lose its piercing moral vision, and tolerate in the name of charity such lapses on the part of friends as true love would rebuke. Francis Paget has reminded us of the note of severity which is found in all love that is worthy of the name. There may well be, he says, a need for more severity towards others, 'just that pure and calm severity which comes of realizing how great are the issues of life—the severity which will never escape from trouble, or anxiety, or loneliness by glossing over things.' This is not the severity of the censorious or of the quick-tempered, but the patient vigilance which spares no effort and is discouraged by no disappointment. This is part of the labour of love. 'Wherefore exhort one another, and build each other up, even as also ye do' (<sup>5</sup>11). 'And we exhort you, brethren, admonish the disorderly, encourage the faint-hearted, support the weak, be longsuffering toward all' (<sup>5</sup>14). This mutual discipline of love is a safeguard against personal laxity, as well as against a lowering of the ethical standard in the community.

3. *Hope*, that neglected virtue in the message of the New Testament, is as prominent in the letters of Paul as in that of Peter. The love that believes all things is the love that hopes all things. If, as the writer to the Hebrews says, faith endures as seeing Him who is invisible, then we may say that hope endures by laying firm hold of the future. It is not the easy optimism which builds castles in the air and refuses to face the stern realities of the immediate present. Nor is it the blithe cheerfulness of the sanguine temperament. Its incarnation is found neither in Mr. Wilkins Micawber nor in Mark Tapley. There is grim determination as well as victorious certainty in hope, as that grace is presented to us in the New Testament, for its setting is a world in dire distress, and the Christian knows that it is only through much tribulation that he must enter into the Kingdom of God. Inspiration is drawn from the powers of the age to come. A new world is called in to redress the balance of the old. Those who serve the living and true God 'wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come' (<sup>1</sup>10). It is well to observe that the endurance of hope is more than mere patience in expectation. Endurance is

an active energy which carries on the appointed task in spite of all the hostile influences of the present evil world. It is significant that Paul condemns severely all who allow the Advent hope to be an excuse for slackness, who await the parousia with folded arms. 'Keep a check upon loafers' is Moffatt's happy rendering of 5<sup>14</sup> (cf. 2 Th 3<sup>6</sup>). Patience is to play its part in the development of the Christian character, 'be patient toward all' (5<sup>14</sup>), for quick-tempered intolerance of timidity and of infirmity of purpose is the besetting temptation of the more virile natures. But Paul would have us learn how to combine this gracious forbearance with a heroic fortitude.

Endurance is the crowning quality,  
And patience all the passion of great hearts.

So far the message of First Thessalonians is one of timeless value, and meets the present situation as fully as it answered the spiritual needs of those men and women who were trying long ago in Macedonia to order their lives according to the Spirit of Christ Jesus. But when we look into the nature of this hope which inspired both the missionary and his converts we seem to have passed out of the realm of the actual into a region of delusive speculation. How can the modern reader find anything, I will not say profitable, but even intelligible in the long since abandoned conceptions and expectations of Jewish apocalyptic? 'For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord' (4<sup>16, 17</sup>). The exquisite comfort of the last words may soften for us the shock with which the earlier sentences fall upon our ears. The language may not offend our sense of reality when it meets us in a familiar hymn. Imagery is in place in poetry where a freer standard of interpretation is available. But Paul was not writing poetically. He was drawing upon the conventional vocabulary of Jewish-Christian religion to describe an event in time towards which he and his fellow-apostles at that stage of Christian history looked forward with sober expectation. In course of time the return of Christ was viewed in a different light. After writing 1 Corinthians, Paul himself never again employs such imagery. Indeed, his teaching about the future life in 2 Corinthians and in Philippians shows a marked advance upon the outworn symbolism of the Thessalonian eschatology.

Nevertheless, before we lightly fling aside this element in our Epistle, let us consider with care what value there may be even yet in these strange words and in the hope which they partly enabled Paul to express.

(1) They serve as a link with the actual life of Jesus upon earth and the way in which He often talked to His disciples about the future. It is probable that Schweitzer and his school have over-emphasized this aspect of our Lord's teaching about the Kingdom of God. But they have at least forced us to recognize that no honest study of the portrait of Jesus given in the earlier Gospels will allow us to reduce Him to the measure of the genial socio-ethical Teacher of the Fatherhood of God which Harnack set before a wondering world in his brilliant lectures, *What is Christianity?* It may well be that current conceptions and familiar forms of thought were sometimes repeated by disciples who failed to recognize with what a changed meaning old terms were used by the Master. But at least such words as those just quoted (4<sup>16, 17</sup>) help us to see how true Paul is to the tradition of the primitive Church. Paul and the other apostles may have been mistaken in their expectation. They were certainly in error in the actual form which their hope assumed. Jesus did not return to earth in visible form on the clouds of heaven. But their emphasis was right. To Jesus the future belongs and not only the past. The once despised Jesus is to receive His vindication on earth, and His beloved disciples are to share with Him the life of the blessed hereafter.

(2) Even though we reject the thought of the physical return of Jesus, we may recognize that the Pauline hope of the return of Christ stands for the principle that the Kingdom of God will only be established on earth by the emergence of supernatural forces. The old complacency of pre-war days which assumed the automatic progress of civilization by natural evolution to millennial perfection has broken down irretrievably. Climax and crisis, visitation and judgment, mean more to us than once they did. It may even be that some stupendous cataclysm in our social order may be needed to wean us from our inordinate trust in the material benefits of the present evil age. Some very relevant words under this head were spoken at the recent Edinburgh Conference on International and Missionary Questions. Dr. Hanns Lilje, General Secretary of the German Student Christian Movement, speaking about Christian Community and Communism, used these words: 'The second thing which Communism is teaching Christianity is



the fact that there is no real religion without a clear eschatological element in it. It is completely hopeless to think that the high expectations of the coming classless society in Communism could be met by a Christianity which dares not believe in the eschatological elements of its own creed. Both things are equally true in Christianity: that the Kingdom of God shall come on earth, that there will be new tidings of forgiveness and all the gifts of God in Jesus Christ in this world, and on the other hand that the disciple of Jesus Christ always is waiting for the coming of his Master. Only a this-worldly Christianity could forget the genuine power of the eschatological expectation of the early Church.'

(3) Another way of regarding the present value of the Advent hope has been taught us by that fine scholar, Dr. Edwyn Bevan, in his essay, 'The Problem of Eschatology,' republished in *Hellenism and Christianity*. If the literal presence of Christ upon the earth nineteen hundred years ago is a fact of great spiritual importance, why should the belief in His presence upon earth at some future age be unspiritual? But how are we to make this thought real to ourselves? Not in the way that first-century Jews, with their totally different cosmogony, would naturally picture their Lord's return. Dr. Bevan reminds us of the two cases recorded in the New Testament of people seeing the Heavenly Christ, the case of Stephen and the case of Paul. Right down through the Christian centuries there have been those who could claim some similar vision of Christ. 'Now supposing these appearances were all, or some of them, the real perception of the living Christ, and suppose in some future state of mankind, its spiritual education having gone much further than it has gone to-day, such a sensible presence of Christ to men were not something occasional and rare, but something normal and common in the lives of all, would not that indeed be the Return of the Lord?'

(4) But however speculative these may seem to some, judged as attempts to find a present value in the eschatology of this Epistle, no one can question the ethical application which was given to this teaching both in the Pauline letters and in the gospel records of our Lord's admonitions to His disciples. 'But concerning the times and seasons, ye . . . yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. When they are saying, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them, . . . and they shall in no wise escape. But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake

you as a thief: for ye are all sons of light, and sons of the day: we are not of the night, nor of the darkness; so then let us not sleep, as do the rest, but let us watch and be sober. . . . For God appointed us not unto wrath, but unto the obtaining of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him. Wherefore exhort one another, and build each other up, even as also ye do' (5<sup>1-11</sup>). How faithfully this warning against 'the unlit lamp and the ungirt loin' recalls the Master's continual call to moral alertness and vigilance: 'Watch, for ye know not the day nor the hour!'

There are still two other things that ought to be said about the treatment of the Advent hope in this Epistle.

(5) Its introduction into this letter is occasioned by sorrow on the part of some Thessalonian Christians, and the Apostle's desire to give them abiding comfort. The Lord is mindful of His own. Our pledge of this is the power of the risen Christ. The Resurrection and the Advent are regarded as correlative terms in the Pauline thought. 'For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him' (4<sup>14</sup>).

(6) The integrity of the Christian character is bound up with this eager hope of the coming of the Lord Jesus. The Apostle is conscious in all his prayers for these converts of 'toil co-operant to an end.' They are waiting for 'his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus' (1<sup>10</sup>). They are to 'walk worthily of God, who calleth you into his own kingdom and glory' (2<sup>12</sup>). 'For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of glorying? Are not even ye, before our Lord Jesus at his coming?' (2<sup>19</sup>). 'To the end he may establish your hearts unblameable in holiness before our God and Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus' (3<sup>13</sup>).

And to crown all, at the end of those terse, penetrating, ethical exhortations with which the letter closes, we have this confident prayer for integrity of character, 'And the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is he that calleth you, who will also do it.'

So, after all, the Pauline eschatology is less concerned with the trumpet blast, and the clouds of heaven, than with the risen Christ and His power to prepare His faithful servants for the crowning experience of rejoining Him that they may be 'for ever with the Lord.'

# Leaders of the Ancient Church.

## V.

### Cyprian of Carthage.

BY PROFESSOR W. D. NIVEN, D.D., GLASGOW.

THE Province of Africa produced half a dozen great Christian leaders or writers. Of the six only one received the high distinction of specific commemoration in the Roman Canon of the Mass. It was neither Tertullian nor Augustine. It was Cyprian, who could be represented as a maintainer of Roman claims to supremacy only by bold and shameless interpolation of his writings. Why the honour of commemoration? Cyprian was not distinguished as theologian, apologist, or expounder of Scripture. His genius did not lie in any such direction. Into theology he scarcely ever entered. His early short apologetic treatise *Quod idola dñi non sint* is little more than a graceful compilation of the *Apologies* of Minucius Felix and Tertullian. He exhibits full knowledge of Scripture, but in his use of texts he is often fanciful, sometimes grotesque and even slightly shocking, as when he argues for wine in the Chalice from Noah's drunkenness and from a quaint translation of Ps 23<sup>5</sup>, 'how excellent is Thy intoxicating cup' (*Ep.* 63).

It was as an ecclesiastical statesman that Cyprian stood out in his own age, and as such his long shadow lies over subsequent ages. He it was who steered the ship of the Church in a safe middle course between the Scylla of laxity and a Charybdis of rigorism. He enunciated principles of polity, discipline, and administration which, modified as they have been in many particulars, scarcely any organized Church has been quite able to ignore.

His name presents difficulty. In one legal document, his proscription, he is named Cæcilius Cyprianus. By the proconsul at his trial he was called Thascius Cyprianus. In his own *Ep.* 66 he calls himself 'Cyprianus qui et Thascius.' Neither 'Thascius' nor 'Cyprianus' admits of easy explanation. Cæcilius is supposed by many to have been adopted by Cyprian out of gratitude to his friend the presbyter who converted him; but what MS. evidence is available shows the presbyter's name to be Cæcilianus.

Of the precise year and place of Cyprian's birth we are ignorant. There is general agreement that he was of mature age when he became a Christian, so his birth may be dated in the early years of the

third century. Of his pre-Christian life we know merely that he was wealthy, and was in great repute as a brilliant advocate and rhetorician in Carthage. As to the kind of religion in which he was nurtured and by what steps he was led to the Faith, we have no information. Some of the influences which were in unknown degree active upon him are perfectly plain. He shows intimate acquaintance with the philosophy of Seneca. That he had read Tertullian and Minucius Felix is plain. The former he called 'the master,' and his writings were his constant pabulum. '*Da magistrum*—bring me the master' was his all but daily command. Then it is well-nigh incredible that even with his excellent memory he could have acquired his extraordinary knowledge of Scripture in the short period that elapsed between his conversion and the opening of his ministry. That he read Scripture before his conversion is more than probable. Then a weighty factor undoubtedly was his association with Cæcilian.

His intellectual power and practical sagacity appear on every page he wrote. His was a commanding yet winsome personality; how else account for Mediterranean sailors naming certain breezes *Cypriani*? Although like 'the master' he can on occasion smite with fierce invective, his prevailing note is courtesy and absence of passion. His deep earnestness is patent, his humility—*mea mediocritas* is characteristic—is no pose. He certainly magnifies his office, but in no other sense than St. Paul did so. Standing adamant for what he believed to be fundamental he could surrender on details to the general views of the clergy in council. His kindness and generosity were boundless. He sold most of his extensive possessions for the benefit of the poor. He was ever thinking how to befriend the stranger, the captive, the prisoner for the gospel's sake (*Epp.* 7, 12, 72). When Carthage lay waste under the plague, he organized relief-work not only for Christians but for all sufferers.

His promotion in the Church was phenomenally rapid and was justifiable only by reason of his altogether exceptional abilities. Baptized in 246,



passing rapidly through the stages of deacon and presbyter, he was by popular acclamation constrained against his desires to accept the Bishopric of Carthage probably in 248 (so Archbishop Benson). What bishops consecrated him we do not know. His election was not quite unanimous. Of the protesters some became devoted to him, but five presbyters were implacable and for years maintained a more or less organized opposition to him. That the restless Novatus, who was to work such mischief, was one of the five is very probable. At all events he became outstanding in opposition to Cyprian. Thus in his very election as a 'neophyte' in the Faith, Cyprian's troubles began. He had other troubles and deeper anxieties in the prevalent condition of the Church. Christians in Africa had enjoyed a long peace from active persecution, and the Church had grown greatly in numbers but had otherwise sadly deteriorated. Some bishops were engaged in agriculture, some in commerce, some in usury (*de Laps.* 5, 6). Some were involved in swindles; some in the slave-trade (*de rebap.* 10). Some were shamefully ignorant; some were vicious (*Augustine, de bap. c. Donat.* vii, 45). Some professing the Faith in fair weather were ready to desert in time of storm (*Ep.* 65). Such unworthy bishops tolerated among their presbyters makers of idols. There was only too strong and patent justification for Cyprian declaring 'long peace had corrupted a Divinely appointed discipline; Faith had been taking her ease and was half-asleep' (*de Laps.* 5).

This degeneracy in the Church, this lifelessness spreading like a foul plague, have not been sufficiently emphasized as elements in any attempted explanation of how Cyprian came to his distinctive views as to the bishop and his function in the Church. All Cyprian's activities were directed to the practical end of calling the lifeless Church to new life and strength. His view of the world was that it was dying of its own corruption. Hope for the world lay in the Church (*World and its Vanities*). But if the Church herself be lifeless no hope at all is left. His perfectly practical aim is to cleanse and revivify the Church that she may save mankind. And the Church may most effectively be purified if her ministers have true notions of what they are, if with all fidelity they exercise discipline over themselves and their flocks. His inspiring motive, I am certain, was not merely an ecclesiastical one, not sacerdotalism, but the strengthening of the Church for the salvation of society.

Cyprian as bishop set himself resolutely, as

occasion offered, to rebuke and correct. From the start almost of his ministry he exercised an influence far beyond the confines of his own See. He never advocated the institution of metropolitans; his views seem logically to exclude that. If he speaks of the 'principal bishop,' he means no more than the bishop of the leading Church. Yet in effect he was a metropolitan and more. He was in frequent communication with Rome, his counsel went with intrinsic authority as far as Spain. To Cyprian the presbyters of Rome applied the title 'Pope' (*Papa*) before, so far as we have any evidence, it was ever applied to the Bishop of Rome.

In one of his earliest letters he dealt with a foul abuse, originating who shall say? by which virgins occupied the same room with young clerics, while professing to preserve unsullied purity. He severely castigates this madness (*Ep.* 4), and orders such associations to be dissolved, with procedure which Ambrose regarded as much too severe. But so grave an abuse needed drastic treatment. Whatever success attended his disciplinary actions in Africa, this strange fanaticism appeared sporadically for long after his day.

Cyprian had occupied his Chair for only eighteen months when there burst upon the Church the great persecution of Decius. For reasons which satisfied his own conscience and common sense he disappeared from public view into retirement. Where he stayed concealed was never divulged. From his retreat he exercised episcopal supervision. So active was he in correspondence with his own presbyters, to whom he delegated certain functions, and with others that Ritschl plausibly suggested that the Government must have turned a blind eye on him. In view of the facts that the heathen of Carthage were clamouring for his blood and that he was specifically proscribed, Ritschl's suggestion is very improbable. We can scarcely believe that the authorities would have left him alone had they been able to discover his whereabouts, for the policy of the persecution was to deal primarily with the leaders of the Church. The case of Luther in the Wartburg is perhaps something of a parallel. Only a few trusted friends, we may suppose, were in the secret; and through them Cyprian was informed of, and was able to guide, Church affairs. The Roman presbyters must have got a shock when their impudent letter to the presbyters of Carthage, in which they practically stigmatize Cyprian as a base deserter and hireling shepherd, was answered not by the presbyters but by Cyprian himself. It showed that in no real or important sense was he an absentee bishop.

I agree with Benson that Cyprian's views as to the place of the bishop in the Church were so fixed for him from the time of his assumption of the office that they underwent no subsequent development. Certainly, too, his views as to the sin of schism. To his mind schism is as the sin of Korah. There is and can be only one Church. For any one outside the Church there is the same hope of salvation as there was for those outside the Ark. The Church is one and indivisible. That there should be a plurality of Churches is unthinkable. What then at once expresses and guarantees the unity of the Church?—the unity of the Episcopate. Whoso is out of communion with the bishop is outside the Church, for the bishop is in the Church, and the Church is in the bishop (*de Unit. eccles.*).

Long before, Ignatius had made similar assertions, but Cyprian not merely asserts, he is confident he can prove. Irenæus, too, had a very clear view of the bishops in their apostolic descent as guardians of true doctrine. What Cyprian emphasizes is wider. In his view the bishops preserve the whole continuous identity of the Church; they are, so to say, constituent of her very essence as an institution. He draws his proof from all Scripture. To him in a real sense the Episcopate did not absolutely begin with the Apostles, important as apostolic origin and succession are. The Christian bishop for Cyprian is the reality of which the Jewish priest was a foreshadow. The Jewish priesthood ceased to have any right to continue after the Jews slew their true High-Priest. Christ henceforward is the only High-Priest who abides for ever. Bishops are the true priests, presbyters are the true levites.

All bishops are equal, and each bishop so far is independent. Yet this independence is limited and that in two ways. One bishop may and ought when needful to admonish or encourage another bishop. Cyprian did so often enough himself. There is nothing in his views to support the notion that each bishop is so independent in his own See that he is liable to no sort of interference from without. Further, each bishop, while relatively supreme in his own See, has a responsibility towards the whole Church. The whole Church is governed by the whole body of bishops, which means far more than that each rules his own diocese. Questions of wide interest to the Church will therefore be decided by the bishops assembled in Council. Yet no bishop can be compelled by the Council to accept its finding. Should there be only one dissident he cannot be forced into agreement with the majority, nor must they break communion

with him. There must be maintained liberty *salvo jure communionis diversa sentire*. If, however, a bishop be found guilty of sin in life or patent error in teaching, the bishops will refuse communion with him and he will be deposed by his *plebes* withdrawing from his ministrations, to which withdrawal the bishops will enjoin them.

What is nearest being new in Cyprian's view of the bishop is the definite equating of the bishop with the Old Testament priest. Whether it be quite new is disputable. There were hints at it before, especially in Tertullian. Tertullian holds by the universal priesthood of all believers, but speaks quite definitely of another priesthood, that of the ministry. He made current the term *sacerdos* as applied to a minister. What Cyprian quite unmistakably does is to make definite what before his time was very vague and ambiguous. So, too, with his rule for the method of electing bishops. Up to his time, bishops seem to have been elected in different ways in various churches. Cyprian himself was elected by popular acclamation, almost by popular tumult. What he lays down as the correct method is that the bishop shall be elected in the place where he is to serve by the comprovincial bishops in presence of the people, according to the law of Moses. The more primitive plan was that the bishop should be elected by the people in presence of neighbouring bishops. Cyprian reverses this, but leaves an important enough part for the people to play. No election is valid without the consent of the people. Once more it is difficult to be sure how far Cyprian is an innovator. The plan he enjoins may have been known to him as the method followed in some churches. What is certain is that not by this method was he himself elected. I suggest that two things shook Cyprian's faith in popular election; first, the unseemliness of his own tumultuous election with its aftermath of intractable opposition; second, the deplorable kind of bishop that, as we have seen, was too often in office. If the ignorant, incompetent, worldly, and scandalous were in their Sees by popular election, some other system undoubtedly seemed desirable. Within his own diocese, according to Cyprian, the bishop is pastor, teacher, and judge. And he is judge in Christ's stead of disqualification from communion and preparedness for restoration and fitness for any kind of service (*Ep.* 17). But the bishop will do nothing without the advice of presbyters, deacons, and laymen (*Epp.* 17, 14, 19). Cyprian is perfectly clear as to the rights and responsibilities of the laity. Their real place in the government of the



Church gradually disappeared because centuries had to pass ere by adequate representation instead of mass assembly a way was discovered for giving their voice that place which Cyprian desiderates.

On many points Cyprian's views have been modified. It was the presbyter, not the bishop, who became specially the priest. The equality of all bishops did not long maintain itself. In great Episcopalian communions bishops are not elected as he desired. The Papacy went far towards abolishing the bishop as Cyprian pictured him. Yet Cyprian's ideas have had profound influence often in unexpected quarters. Calvin on schism is very reminiscent of Cyprian. Cyprian's conception of the bishop's part in the government not only of his diocese but of the Church was perhaps never so ably expounded as it was—of course without the word 'bishop'—in the controversy that arose in the Westminster Assembly between the Presbyterians and the Independents.

Another consequence of Cyprian's equating of the bishop with the Jewish priest was this—the bishop is a sacrificing priest. What sacrifice does he offer? In a single parenthetical sentence Cyprian makes an epoch-marking and epoch-making statement—THE PASSION OF THE LORD IS THE SACRIFICE WE OFFER (*Ep.* 63). Cyprian was no theologian, he nowhere unfolds the significance of this statement; yet it was his to make perhaps the most important statement that was made regarding the Sacrament. From Cyprian the development was rapid which transformed the Eucharist of early times into the Sacrifice of the Mass.

From the time of his return to open discharge of his duty till his martyrdom under Valerian, Cyprian was involved in controversy as to discipline. Many who had professed the Faith denied it under stress of persecution. Those *lapsi* were not homogeneous. Some were more deeply involved in real apostasy than others. Many repented of their defection while still the storm was raging, and desired reconciliation with the Church. Others waited till persecution ceased. What was to be done about them? Were they to be re-admitted to communion; and if so, after what discipline? The question, difficult enough at the simplest, was complicated by many having secured recommendations to mercy from martyrs and confessors, and by this time those terms had been extended to any who in any degree had suffered for their Faith. 'Letters of peace,' as they were called, could be easily obtained, they existed by the thousand; and might even be bought. Here was then the dilemma. It was very difficult to disregard the desires of a

martyr; on the other hand, to re-admit *lapsi* simply because they could produce an 'indulgence' in their favour was to end all Church discipline and effective authority, and meant putting a premium on apostasy.

The problem led to two schisms, one in Carthage, another far more serious in Rome. Novatus, that intractable presbyter, took part in both, though the one was poles asunder from the other. Novatus found both useful as a means of annoying Cyprian. The party of Felicissimus at Carthage took and acted on the lax view, and re-admitted *lapsi* on the easiest terms. The party of Novatian at Rome at the other extreme refused to re-admit on any terms at all. Into the long story we need not enter. It was Cyprian's policy which became the policy of the Catholic Church. It was a reasonable policy, neither lax nor unchristian in harshness. Cases were to be examined carefully by the bishops sitting in council. They and not the confessors are the rulers of the Church; it is the responsibility of the bishops to admit to or debar from communion, and to determine what length of penitential discipline must be imposed on each *lapsus*. Against Novatianist harshness the Church will re-admit the truly penitent even as God forgives sin. Anything else is a contradiction of the gospel.

It perplexed Augustine, and it perplexes all, to find that Cyprian, so reasonable and so truly Christian in taking this middle course between laxity and harshness, fell himself into something like Novatianism on the question as to the validity of baptism by heretics and schismatics. This led to a strife between Rome and Carthage from which Rome emerged victorious. Cyprian held, and a Council of eighty-seven bishops unanimously agreed with him, that heretics and schismatics being outside the Church could not possibly give admission to the Church; in consequence all baptized outside the Church and desiring communion with the Church must be re-baptized. Stephen of Rome without a Council effectively answered in a few sentences that baptismal grace came not from the baptizer but from Christ. Cyprian was not convinced, but no fresh schism took place. His views were never definitely retracted, but seem to have been quietly set aside. He had strong support in the East, and with the growth of the Roman practice of 'conditional' baptism, it may be questioned whether he was so decisively defeated after all. His error was largely due to this that he had no conception of a distinction which Augustine found so useful between the Church visible and the Church invisible.

## In the Study.

### Virginibus Puerisque.

#### Keeping in Touch.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM ROSS, B.D.,  
EDINBURGH.

'Let us draw near with a true heart.'—Heb 10<sup>22</sup>.

SOME time ago a teacher in a Sunday school spoke to her children about 'Communion,' and tried to explain the meaning of the word. Having explained it as clearly and fully as possible, she asked the children to put the meaning of it in their own words. Several answers were given, but one girl gave the perfect reply when she said, 'I think it is keeping in touch with Jesus.'

My subject then is 'Keeping in touch,' and (1) I would say keep in touch with your minister. John Ruskin says in one of his books that a minister should know every lamb in his flock as well as every sheep. They want to do so very much, but it is no easy matter, and young people can help very much. Ministers are busy people, and they hurry along the street at a great pace, and they often pass the little ones of their own congregation without seeing them. You, children, should not let them. Get as near to them as possible and look up and smile and salute them.

A minister in the west of Scotland met a lady on the street with her little nephew. He stopped, shook hands with the lady and spoke to her, but, being in a hurry, he was about to pass on without speaking to the boy. Robin was hurt and disappointed, and went forward and said, 'Mr. Weir, this is me.' Mr. Weir is now dead, but he told that story in the General Assembly long ago, and he told also how much pleasure that incident gave him and how careful he was afterwards to see and to smile to his young people on the street.

(2) Keep in touch with Jesus Christ. I read in a book recently that many a battle goes wrong and many a war is lost because soldiers get out of touch. The battles of our life often go wrong and the wars are lost because we do not keep in touch with Christ.

In the difficult and dangerous parts of the Alps climbers are roped to their guides. A young mountaineer once asked his guide that he might be unroped that he might climb by himself. The climb was dangerous and the guide was unwilling, but the youth was persistent in his request and the guide yielded and the rope was loosed and taken

off. For some time he got on well, but they came to a steep slope and his axe failed to hold and he slid down and down till he came to a bank of snow at the top of a precipice of bare rocks; here his course was stayed, and he hung in the balance for a moment, but fell over and was killed. Speaking of it afterwards, the guide said that if he had had hold of a thread at that moment he would have been saved, but he had hold of nothing and his life was lost. Boys and girls, life is safe always so long as you keep hold of Jesus Christ.

A mother once said to her little girl that prayer was just like speaking to God through a phone. The child thought that her prayers went through the phone. The family were about to move to another house, and the little girl was anxious about it and wanted to keep in touch with God, and the night before moving, she said in her evening prayer, 'God bless Daddy, God bless Mummy, God bless everybody, and please God our new phone number is 68432.' Childlike and innocent, but delightful to think that the little one wanted to keep in touch with God.

Not long ago when I was in London, a friend called for me to drive me through Richmond Park to Hampton Court. He was very happy, and the secret of it came out when during the drive he told me how he had come to know and love Christ and give himself to Him. One thing he said then I shall never forget: 'The strongest desire I have is that I might get nearer to God, I want to keep always in touch with Him.'

#### White Mice.

BY THE REVEREND D. M. HERCUS, B.A.,  
BROOKLYN, WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND.

'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.'—  
1 Th 5<sup>21</sup>.

I wonder if any of you keep white mice as pets. I can remember all manner of animals that some of us used to keep as pets years ago in England. There were rabbits, both white and grey; doves, bantams, cats and dogs of course, white rats and guinea-pigs—wonderful animals, guinea-pigs, I suppose you know about them—if you hold them up by their tails their eyes drop out. Just you try one and see; it won't hurt him, because when you come to look for his tail you'll find he hasn't got one! All these we used to keep and play with, and—white mice.



I never had white mice myself, though I had rabbits and caterpillars and beetles, as well as a dog and some chickens when I was older, but I had a friend who had the most beautiful white mice, all in a big cage with a wonderful little treadmill wheel which they used to turn as they ran round and round in it. He had one so tame that he used to take it round with him in his pocket; when the sums were hard in school it was a great comfort for him to be able to reach down into his pocket and feel wee Mickie there warm and happy, and to know that even the arithmetic lesson does not last for ever. Of course he had to be careful that teacher did not know; for she was a lady and did not understand about mice.

Yes, white mice. I suppose some of the girls think it sounds very dreadful to make a pet of a mouse. The mice we generally see are such nasty, dirty, little beasts that we set traps to catch them because we think them so horrid. But *white* mice are entirely different. They are clean, whatever girls may say, beautiful to look at too, with their tiny pink ears, and their bright wee eyes, and their fine long tails. They would never make nasty holes and get into the bread tin and spoil every one's breakfast.

Do you know, in Edinburgh Castle they have a wonderful building called the Scottish National War Memorial, and round its walls there are carved memorials to all the brave men who fought and died for their country years ago. Nor are the animals forgotten either. There are carvings telling about them too—elephants, and donkeys, and horses, and even reindeer—they all 'did their bit.' The carvings are there to remind us of how they helped, and to show that we are thankful to them.

And—would you believe it?—among the animals carved there on the walls of the Temple of Scotland's pride there are—yes—white mice. Why were they put there? What could white mice do to help win the War? Let me tell you.

They are called 'The Tunnellers' Friends.' You see, it was sometimes necessary in the War to dig deep tunnels under the ground. When the men went down to dig them, sometimes the air was almost all used up; it became what we call 'too stuffy to breathe,' and they were in danger of being poisoned by the little bad air that was left. So they used to take down with them one or two white mice in a cage. So long as the air was fresh the little chaps played in their cage. As soon as it began to get too thick and foul they felt ill and tired and stopped running about, and then the men

knew that it was time to stop digging and go up to the top of the ground until it was fresh and sweet again. The mice kept a look out for them against the bad air and gave them warning of the danger. And that is why there are white mice carved on the walls of the Scottish National War Memorial in Edinburgh. It shows what even a wee white mouse can do.

I think God wants us to be like white mice sometimes. I don't mean only that we should always be just as still and quiet as mice when we are in His House; most of you are very good that way already. But also like them in keeping a sharp look out for 'bad air.' There are things which poison the air we breathe into our bodies so that we shall be ill if we breathe it too long. And there are also things which poison the air which our souls breathe so that they die if they breathe it too long. God wants us to be like the white mice, which always prefer the fresh air, and give warning when it gets bad. And when some one is poisoning the air our souls have to breathe by asking us to tell lies or say mean and dirty things or think mean and dirty thoughts, we must show them that we prefer fresh air for our souls, that we must have it, and will have nothing else. It is a fine thing to be one of God's wee white mice; it means that we try all the time to obey Paul's advice to 'prove all things,' and 'hold fast that which is good'; and it means that we do it for Jesus' sake.

### The Christian Year.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

#### Knowledge through Work.

'His servants shall do him service; and they shall see his face.'—Rev 22<sup>3</sup>. 4 (R.V.).

Since Jesus stood in the carpenter's shop at Nazareth, the prosaic place of honest labour has become holy ground. Experience has taught us that there are certain fundamentals of character which cannot be learnt from pleasure or from pain, but only from work.

Miss Stoddart, in *Great Lives Divinely Planned*, writes of the historian John Richard Green, that his 'enthusiasm for historical study, which had dwindled during his first two years as an undergraduate at Jesus College, was revived by a course of lectures he heard from Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, afterwards Dean of Westminster. Writing in 1863 to congratulate Dr. Stanley on his engagement to Lady Augusta Bruce, the future historian thus acknowledged his debt: "I was utterly miserable

when I wandered into your lecture-room, and my recollection of what followed is not so much of any definite words as of a great unburthening. Then and after I heard you speak of work not as a thing of classes and fellowships, but as something worthy for its own sake, worthy because it made us like the great worker. That sermon on work was like a revelation to me. 'If you cannot or will not work at the work which Oxford gives you, at any rate work at something.' I took up my old boy-dream—history, I think I have been a steady worker ever since."

God's revelations are not reserved for those smaller and more definite acts of communion with Him which we call prayer. The larger parts of life are illuminated by His Presence. When we begin to realize that all our work is work for Him; that the work in the study, the office, and the shop may be His as truly as the ministry in the Church or the mission room, then we shall learn to expect such visits of encouragement and guidance as some great employer of labour now and again pays to his workpeople. At first, indeed, it seems as though such could never be so vivid or illuminating as the tokens of His Presence granted in prayer, but we soon learn that even the spiritual help which is given in prayer is given, indeed, that the work may be the better done.

It may be that as we have prayed we have experienced something like that which a friend of Bishop Moule described in such glowing terms. 'The glory and beauty of my Saviour's Person, the indescribable reality of His Presence both in me and around me, the absolute "all sufficiency" of His grace and power, the loveliness and attraction of His "perfect will," all shone upon me with a brightness of which the August sunshine seemed but a type and shadow.' It may be that we have known something like that, and, whilst the sense of it was strong upon us, there came a sudden summons to go off to some dull, prosaic duty, some work that we could not well postpone. It seems almost profane to disturb that Presence which is now so near us. But to us, as to the monk in the Legend, come the words:

Do thy duty; that is best—  
Leave unto the Lord the rest;

and as we go forth in obedience his experience is ours. As the Bishop's friend expresses it: 'In a sense the glory passed away, as to special excitation. But in a sense, in a yet deeper sense, it abode, diffused among the experiences of life, and proving "its sober certainty of waking bliss" by its power

amidst these experiences to calm and purify and lift above the selfishness of the old life.'

But not only shall we take into our work the sense of that fellowship which has been our joy in prayer, for

Hadst thou stayed, I must have fled,

but we shall find in it, from time to time, what we may best describe as 'surprise visits,' *i.e.* special manifestations of His Presence such as He has again and again granted to His friends.

It was whilst Moses was watching his father-in-law's sheep that God was revealed to him. It was whilst Gideon was threshing his wheat that he saw the mysterious angel of the Lord watching his work. It was whilst Saul was seeking his father's asses that his future was first revealed to him. It was whilst Levi was at his business at the receipt of custom that the Lord appeared to him with the summons, 'Follow me.' It was whilst the disciples, St. James, St. John, and St. Peter, were busy washing their nets that they received that revelation of the Lord which led them to forsake all and follow Him. It was when the women were returning from the sepulchre, whither they had gone to anoint the Lord's body, that He met them.

Instances such as these might be multiplied from the experience of those who have had faith to look for them. Handel's account of the manifestation of the Divine Presence when he was at work on the 'Hallelujah Chorus'—'I did think I did see all heaven before me and the great God Himself'—is not strange to many an artist, many a writer, who, in some picture or poem afterward famous, has felt his heart burn within him, the sure sign of His Presence whose 'delight it is to be with the sons of men' whilst engaged in labour.

There are many illustrations of the words which may have been spoken by Christ, 'Lift the stone, and *there* thou shalt find Me. Cleave the wood, and I am there.' Of the many interpretations, that which refers them to the revelation of our Lord amidst humble duties seems to be most satisfactory. Neither the lifting of stones nor the cutting of wood is work of a specially interesting and lofty character, and yet all are at times engaged in such pursuits. The removal of a stumbling-block from the path of a friend; or of some difficulty in the way of a puzzled child; or the simpler tasks fulfilled by every teacher in making learning easier and pleasanter—these may be means by which the Lord will be found. From the witness of the Scriptures and Christian biographies, and from a comparison of the revelations made to those at work with those



made to such as were engaged in prayer or worship, we find that we are more likely to meet the Lord whilst pursuing our daily duty than whilst occupied in private devotion. The work may seem to be poor and dull by comparison, but the character of the work matters nothing provided it be 'in the Lord.'

We have cited these experiences simply to show that work as well as prayer offers a natural means of knowing the Lord—that so Christ has in the past *directly* revealed Himself. And what He has done He will continue to do. But the manner of His doing this will vary not only from age to age, but with the individual; for, here again, we must remind ourselves that the plain purpose of His revelation is that we should know Him. Now, an outward form would, we venture to think, be the least effective in reaching our spiritual consciousness. Naturally we should be so taken up with the external aspect as to be in danger of losing the spiritual message it was intended to convey. And so we may believe that, not only in our own time, but in the Apostolic Age, that form of revelation was uncommon.

Bishop Westcott, in his *Studies on the Risen Life of our Lord*, shows that even to the last the disciples 'knew the Lord only through the interpretation they put upon their experience. . . . Without patient obedience, without cheerful labour, without living insight, those to whom the Lord came would not have known Him. He would have been to them only as one mere chance wayfarer who had crossed their path. This is the uniform law. "The world beholdeth me no more, but ye behold me" is the final promise to the faithful. It was in vain that His brethren, in a moment of unbelief, bade Him manifest Himself to the world. From the world, which has not the will to obey or the eyes to see the true Christ, the risen Christ must be always hidden.' But, on the other hand, the eye of faith sees Him, and 'He is recognized not by His person, but by His working. The gift of success and the gift of refreshment are seen to belong to Him and to make Him known.' The gift of success! How often we are tempted to take it as the natural outcome of the work. We have laboured for it, taken every pains to secure it, and, therefore, it is natural that we should have it. It is our own doing, and the congratulations of our friends assume that it is. Or even if we do recognize that it is from the hand of Christ; if, like St. John on the sea of Galilee, we say when we see a result far beyond our expectation, 'It is the Lord'; yet, even then, we are not disposed to pursue the matter

further and to see what special revelation it carries with it, what further knowledge of Him we reach by it. And yet it is as a sign that it is given to us: a sign either of approbation of the methods we have adopted, or of encouragement that we may go further, or of teaching that as by a parable we may learn its spiritual counterpart. And as we dwell on it, ponder it, and consider its relation to ourselves, our families, or the Church, we learn what is meant by it, and through it gain a new knowledge of the Lord.

It is not otherwise when the work brings refreshment or failure. In the one case, we have a sense of the Lord working with us and imparting to us the joy that sustained Him in all that He did, and we feel that it is His law and appointment that work should bring life. In the other case we learn that failure is no necessary mark of disapproval; that, whilst it rightly leads to revision and careful consideration of principles and methods, it also reminds us that He whose work was perfect failed, failed in Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida. And so, taught by the Spirit of God, all our work becomes a canvas on which is worked in fuller and fuller measure the fact of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

#### SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION.

##### To whom do we Pray?

'When ye pray, say, Father.'—Lk 11<sup>2</sup> (R.V.).

It is not possible to get any clear idea of what prayer ought to be until we have discovered to Whom we address our prayers, and people sometimes think very strange things about the God to whom they pray. They have thought that He was the kind of person who would like numbers of animals to be killed in His honour; they have thought He might like human beings killed in His honour. Some people have even imagined that He wanted them to kill their own children in His honour.<sup>2</sup> In *Adventures of the Black Girl in her Search for God*, Mr. Shaw makes God say, 'Slay it here before me as a sacrifice; for I love the smell of newly spilled blood.'

But Mr. Maxwell in *Adventures of the White Girl in her Search for God* shows Mr. Shaw up as too literal. 'And so the white girl took her niblick and followed the dramatist into the forest in search of God. She also took her Bible with her in order that she might compare its outworn theories and superstitions with the truth which the dramatist would show her.'

<sup>1</sup> G. H. S. Walpole, *Vital Religion*, 80.

<sup>2</sup> A. Maude Royden, *Prayer as a Force*, 110.

'Before long they came to the place where the black girl had met the mamba.

' "Near here," said the dramatist, "you will find a false God who will be very angry if you do not at once kneel down and worship him. He will tell you to bring your favourite child and slay it before him as a sacrifice, for he loves the smell of newly spilled blood. If you say that you have no child, he will tell you to fetch your father and let him slay you."

'The white girl felt very angry when she heard this, and grasped her niblick firmly, intending to attack this cruel God when she got the chance.

'The dramatist beckoned her to follow him, and led her to a pile of rocks on which sat enthroned the God of whom he had been speaking. To her surprise there seemed to be a look of great sorrow and tenderness on the face of the God, and the white girl, whose heart was kind although her tongue was sharp, climbed up the rocks and asked Him what troubled Him.

' "I am sorrowful," He replied, "because My people make such sad mistakes about Me and because these wrong ideas make them do such cruel things. They even want to kill their children before Me, because they think it will show that they love Me even more than they love their children. People learn things very slowly, and can only grasp one new idea at a time. I am now going to teach them that the true God does not desire such things."

'The white girl looked round and saw an old man coming towards them, accompanied by a young man who appeared to be his son. The young man carried a bundle of wood and the old man had a large, sharp knife. When they were near the pile of rocks the old man took some stones and built an altar, laying the wood upon it. Then he suddenly seized his son and bound him and laid him upon the wood on the altar [*Gen. xxii.*].

' "What are you doing?" said the white girl.

' "I am going to sacrifice my son, my only son, Isaac," said the old man, and he lifted the knife to cut the throat of his son.

'And then the God spoke.

' "Abraham, Abraham!" He said.

' "Here I am," the man replied.

' "Do not lay hands on the lad, do nothing to him," said the God. "I know that you care for Me more even than you care for your lad; but I do not desire human sacrifice, I abhor it. If you wish to sacrifice, then sacrifice that ram caught by its horns in the brushwood."

'After Abraham and Isaac had gone away the

God said: "Now they will know that it does not please Me if they bring their children and slay them before Me as a sacrifice. Abraham *thought* that I had told him to sacrifice his son. Now he *knows* that I do not wish it. When they have fully learned that lesson I shall teach them that I take no pleasure in the sacrifice of animals, that I love kindness, and that the most acceptable offering is a life of obedience, and faith and love."

' "Well, you were quite wrong about *him*, at any rate," said the white girl to the dramatist.'

Mr. Harold Anson (in *Concerning Prayer*) describes some of the strangely conceived gods to whom people have made their prayers. He gives extracts from a book written by St. Ignatius. 'Consider the anger of God avenging this first sin [of Adam] on all the descendants of the first sinner: pestilence, war, famine, desolation of the earth; so many disasters, so many violent deaths, so many tears shed, so many crimes committed, so many children for ever deprived of the sight of God, so many souls cast into hell. What consequences and what chastisements for one single sin! . . . Ask yourself what this God is who punishes a single mortal sin in this manner.'

How could any one worship such a God? But to generations as far removed from us as we are from St. Ignatius many of our ideas of God will perhaps appear not less terrible and strange than the ideas just described.

But the knowledge that other people will turn with scorn from the shallowness, the meanness, the sordidness of our ideas, should only spur us to make the utmost effort to discover what God is really like; for we have not got very far yet. People think of Him, they have been taught to think of Him, as a God who delights in war; who even in war is strangely capricious and unjust. They say that 'God always takes the best,' when some brilliant young life, full of promise, is extinguished. Some one dies who does not think of himself or herself and therefore is likely to be in the way of a danger—which we have caused—and we say how capricious is God, who so often takes away the best!

When, therefore, we pray, we are apt to spend a great deal of time in telling God what He had better do, feeling by no means sure either of His wisdom or His power; we entreat Him to do it, and then we waste a good deal of strength in being anxious for fear that He will not. We have no assurance that He wants to do the best for us, nor have we any conviction that He knows what the best is, and the faith which brings the answer to prayer



becomes for these reasons a demand upon us both unreasonable and cruel. If God is really so capricious and irrational, for Him to ask us to have faith in prayer is most unreasonable, most cruel. It is not possible to have great faith in such a God.

Many people pray to one who seems more diabolical than divine. Their prayers go into the void, for this being whom they imagine is not there.

Do we perhaps pray to ourselves? Well, that is something. There is a divine spirit in us and we can achieve something by our soul's sincere desire: but the conquering power of a great faith is almighty in power and is only possible in proportion as we know and truly worship the God to whom we pray. Is not that what our Lord meant when He said, 'Ask in my name,' and—'When ye pray, say, Father'? If we who are evil and stupid know how to give good gifts to our children, how much more should our Father that is in heaven know and give them! Should we give them something lovely? That is what God is like: that is what He desires to do.

This is why we should continually seek to know more and more about God. Now we see through a glass very darkly, but some day, face to face. Now we know a little, but at last shall know even as we are known; and on the degree of our knowledge our faith depends. The faith which is required to make our prayer effective depends on knowledge. It is not knowledge, but it depends on knowledge. The difference between faith and superstition is precisely this, that faith depends on knowledge and superstition on ignorance. If we are going to make a leap we take a run; but if we run in the wrong direction the farther we jump the farther we are from our goal. Faith is a venture indeed. But its basis is reason. Let us reason as far as we can. Then, and only then, take the leap which we call Faith.

To believe what is not true is to become weak and powerless. Let us take an extreme example. If a man believes that he is God, he believes a lie. There are people who believe it. It is not an uncommon delusion among the insane. But such a belief does not bring power and freedom.

If we believe that there is a divine spirit within us, and that it is possible and natural for us to be in communion with the Divine—if we believe that, we find our faith gives us power, because it *is* faith—it is belief in Truth. Let us be sure that we are praying to a God who is our Father: that is the truth.

To what God do we pray? Let us purify our conception of God and be sure that it is as near

the truth as we can reach in these conditions of time and space; and then when we pray our prayer ascends to God and is answered.<sup>1</sup>

WHITSUNDAY.

The Spirit of Joy.

'But the fruit of the Spirit is . . . joy.'—Gal 5<sup>22</sup>.

In the paragraph from which these words are taken the Apostle is drawing a contrast between life in the flesh and life in the Spirit. 'Flesh' must not be understood as if it meant just the physical substance of these bodies of ours. In the Apostle's use of it 'flesh' is not so much a material as an ethical and doctrinal term. It is the lower, baser, sinful side of this human nature of ours. But there is also a higher side. And between these two sides of our human nature there rages ceaseless war—'the flesh lusts against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.'

That is true of every one. But this letter was written specifically to Christian people. And the mark of the Christian was that he had received the Holy Spirit and lived by His power. The Spirit, to the Christian man, was not simply some vague aspiration after higher things—it was the very life and power of God within him. But it was possible for men who professed to have received the Spirit to live in the sphere of the flesh.

'The works of the flesh . . . the fruit of the Spirit.' There is some significance in that variation of words: '*Works* of the flesh . . . *fruit* of the Spirit.' 'Works' suggests something made, produced, artificially fabricated. Works are not the offspring of life. Every *made* thing is dead. Man has been able to produce some marvellous things. We gaze with something like awe at the mighty buildings he erects. But, wonderful though his inventions and creations are, there is one thing he has never been able to create, and that is *life*. All his works—however vast and wonderful—are dead things. Cathedrals, locomotives, aeroplanes—they are all dead things. And that is why the Apostle uses the word of the effects of yielding to fleshly impulse. 'If ye live after the flesh,' he says in one place, 'ye shall die.' These works of the flesh which he enumerates here, 'fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, sorcery,' and so on, are the enemies of life, they are dead things and deadly things, and they carry the seeds of death within themselves.

But the '*fruit* of the Spirit,' and fruit is only found where there is life. An apple tree or a pear

<sup>1</sup> A. Maude Royden, *Prayer as a Force*, III.

tree must be alive if it is to give golden fruit in the autumn. Now, the Spirit is just the life of God in the soul. The Spirit is a vitalizing power and, as a result, where the Spirit is there is fruit, and the presence of the Spirit is known by the fruit it produces: 'the *fruit* of the Spirit is love, joy, peace,' and so on.

The Apostle meant something also when he described the result of yielding to the flesh as 'works' (plural), and the issue of life in and by the Spirit as 'fruit' (singular). 'Works' are dead things, and there is no coherence or cohesion in dead things. The works of the flesh disintegrate the character. There is no unity in death. The man who yields to the flesh becomes the victim of various appetites and lusts—'the *works* of the flesh.' But the 'fruit' of the Spirit—because all the virtues grow out of the presence of the Spirit like, let us say, a cluster of grapes on the same stem. It is not a case of the Spirit in one man revealing itself in *love*, and in another man in *joy*, and in another man in *kindness*, and in another in *self-control*. They all spring from the one life.

The fruit of the Spirit on which we want to concentrate attention is the one the Apostle mentions second, 'The fruit of the Spirit is . . . joy.' Without this mark of 'joy,' we haven't got the Spirit—at any rate, not in fullness. It is in this respect we modern Christians are so startlingly different from the Christians of the first century. Nobody, by any stretch of the imagination, could speak of us as a joyous people. Why is that?—for where the Spirit is really present there is an irrepressible gladness. There is only one conclusion—that our religious experiences have not been deep enough. We are much in the condition the disciples were in those days between Easter and Pentecost, when they kept themselves locked in the Upper Room for fear of the Jews. They had the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus to preach about, but they remained dumb. We are much like that. Christmas Day, Good Friday, Easter Day—we know all about the facts they commemorate. But there has not been a Pentecost in our experience. We have no sense of the Spirit as a triumphant power within us, and so, in face of a hostile world, we are despondent and distressed. Dr. Stanley Jones tells a story of a negro woman who, while the minister was unfolding the glorious gospel, kept shouting, 'Glory' and 'Hallelujah.' Some tried to make her keep quiet. 'I can't,' she exclaimed, 'for I's overcharged.' That was the condition of the disciples after Pentecost—they were 'overcharged,' and therefore irrepressible and

irresistible. 'To the discomfiture of every one they listened to false accusations in council halls, while their faces shone like those of angels; they departed from judgment halls with bleeding backs, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer for His name; they rejoiced their way through prisons and saluted death with a smile.' And the reason for it all was this: they knew Jesus as a glorious Presence and Power in their soul. So they marched to music. The fruit of the Spirit was . . . joy. And what we want to banish our weakness and our anxieties and our fears is just a similar experience of the Spirit.

What did Pentecost mean for those first disciples? To begin with, it meant this: *Jesus had come back*. Their happiness was only complete when they were with Him and He was with them, and that happiness of theirs was simply dashed to the ground when He said that He was going to leave them. The grief of David over the death of Jonathan, or of Tennyson over the death of Arthur Hallam, was nothing to the grief these disciples felt at the mere prospect of losing Jesus.

When they saw Him on the Cross, their hearts broke. They had lost their dearest and best. Easter, of course, scattered that despair of theirs, for they knew that their Lord was not dead. But Easter didn't give them their Lord back again. During the space of the great Forty Days He appeared now and again, but those were just fleeting appearances. And without Him—even though they knew He was alive—the disciples felt very timid and helpless.

But at Pentecost He came back *to stay*. That is the whole meaning of Pentecost. Pentecost was the fulfilment of His promise, 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' In the person of His Holy Spirit, Jesus ceased to be localized and became universalized. It did not matter where they went, it did not matter in what circumstances they found themselves, Jesus was with them. He was with them, because He was *in* them. For those of us who have sons or daughters in some far-distant part of our Empire it is a great day when the time of furlough comes round and our dear ones come back. But we know they come back only to go away again. Over their weeks or months of furlough there lies the shadow of coming departure. It is pathetic to read how Mary Livingstone longed for the day of Livingstone's return, and how passionately she longed for the day when he should return to stay. That is what happened at Pentecost—Jesus came back to stay!



And the second thing that Pentecost did for these disciples was this: it brought them the *assurance of triumph*. Jesus had laid upon these first disciples of His a tremendous task—they were to go into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation, and they were to begin in the most difficult place of all—at Jerusalem. Easter came, but even the knowledge that their Lord was alive was not sufficient to inspire them to make a start. During those forty days the little church was a church behind closed doors. But when Pentecost came, and they knew that Jesus was with them in the Person of His Spirit, they flung the doors wide open and began preaching their gospel boldly to the assembled pilgrims in Jerusalem. And nothing could daunt them.

They used to say during the American Civil War that the coming of General McClellan was as good as the addition of another battalion to the army—he brought with him a certain confidence of victory. Lord Kitchener had a similar effect on the British folk. When he knew he was at the head of affairs we felt everything would be all right. And his very name was good for a million men. All that, and infinitely more, the coming of the Spirit was to the first disciples. After all, McClellan and Kitchener were no guarantee of victory. The one was superseded and the other died before the victory was won. But the disciples, inspired with this blessed assurance that God was with them, that all the might of God was working through them, flung themselves with a kind of dash and gaiety upon that embattled world. 'The fruit of the Spirit was joy.'

Joy multiplies our strength. Dr. Hadfield, the great specialist, says that 'we are only as tired as our minds,' which means that tiredness will flee once we realize that we have power adequate to all our needs. And we have that adequate power in the Spirit of God—the Christ, who is with us always. Joy is not to be manufactured. Multiplication of machinery will never give us that assurance of triumph which will enable us to sing as we move to battle. But if we really let God into our lives and hearts, He will soon demonstrate His own presence. And when we feel His presence then will come the joy. Dr. Stanley Jones tells how the Himalayan villagers, when engaged in weeding their fields, work to music. One of them is beating a drum and all of them are singing. And we shall go to our work with music in our souls and on our lips if we have the Spirit.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. D. Jones, *Richmond Hill Sermons*, 221.

### TRINITY SUNDAY.

#### Immanence and Personality.

'A rainbow round about the throne.'—Rev 4<sup>3</sup>.

Divine immanence means the presence of a throbbing spiritual life in every movement of the universe, not only the revolutions of planets and the rushing of winds, but the fluttering of a bird's wing and the bursting of the buds in spring. That such a teaching as this is, if not peculiar, at least not foreign to the Christian faith, no one who has rejoiced in the great feast of Whitsuntide can for a moment doubt. Nor can it fail to appeal with irresistible fascination to the mind of any man who feels the harmony between his own spirit and the manifold life of Nature.

Divine immanence! Yes, the thought is full of beauty and consolation when amid the fret of modern life the spirit seeks repose. But what power has this doctrine to arm us for the hour of battle, to guide us when we are face to face with that stern prerogative of manhood, the tremendous necessity of choice, and to uphold us in the evil day?

There is a striking scene in which Mr. Shorthouse has described his hero, John Inglesant, in the great crisis of his life. He stands in the loggia of the pavilion, where, in the deep glades of the Italian forest, he had halted with the young girl, his companion, on their midnight flight from Florence to Pistoia. Silence enwraps the world. The brilliant moonlight gleams on the enchanted woods. Above him in thick festoons hang the luxuriant creepers. The air is heavy with sensuous perfumes, and Inglesant himself is flushed with wine. The very harmony of his surroundings, the spirit that breathes in the still air, bids him go forward. There are no restraints of custom or public opinion in the hot southern land to hold him back. He turns. He is about to enter the room behind him; when, lo! as the first wind of the returning dawn sighs among the trees, he is kneeling as on those Sunday mornings long ago in England among the small community at Little Gidding as they receive the communion of Christ's body and blood; and then standing by the dying bed of the saintly Mary Collet, as he hears her say, 'I will do nothing night and day while I live, Johnny, but pray to Jesus that He may lead you to Himself.' And then the spell is broken, for once again he has seen the glory of God.

In the moments which make or mar a man, which do not await our opportunity but which anticipate with hasty feet our readiness to meet them, when

action must be now or never, then those pleasant dreams of Divine immanence and the spirit of the universe will prove of no avail. One thing, and one alone, can help the imperilled soul, and that is the voice of God and the vision of the Great White Throne.

Let us take a typical Old Testament scene and consider the path by which men have been led to recognize God. We are on Horeb, on the lower slopes of which Moses feeds his flock. It is the story of the Burning Bush. Ah! here, we say, is Divine immanence. Well!

Earth's crammed with heaven,  
And every common bush afire with God;  
But only he who sees, takes off his shoes,  
The rest sit round it and pluck blackberries.

Moses saw. Moses heard the voice of the personal God proclaiming as His name, 'I will be what I will be.' What does this mean? 'You and your people,' the voice seems to say, 'are at the beginning of a great living experience in which, if only you are true to what you have already learned, if only you are faithful to conscience, to each still, small voice of the Eternal that summons you to fresh acts of obedience, to new destinies, to expanding opportunities, to progressive enfranchisements, to an ever closer walk with God, He shall reveal to you, as you are able to bear it, His abiding nature and His everlasting Name.'

Those who bow the knee before the Sacred Trinity have reached the consummation of that great experience, the earlier stages of which are represented by Moses. We learn what God is, not by thinking but by living, not by argument but by obedience. If God be indeed not force nor power nor even spirit but personality, this must be so. The discovery of personality even among men is to any one who has a genius for sympathy and friendship a perpetual wonder and delight. But it is a progressive revelation that makes a constant and painful demand upon the labour, the responsiveness, the tears of him who would fain explore the mysteries of the human spirit. Again and again what could never have become known by the anticipations of reason, even about our fellow-men, is verified in the experience of life. So is it with God. There must come, first of all, the conviction of the guiding hand that directs, the everlasting arms that support, our life.

But if God be indeed a personal God, then He has a further communication for every soul of man. Have we faith enough to bear it?

When God of old came down from heaven,  
In power and wrath He came;  
Before His feet the clouds were riven,  
Half darkness and half flame.

We cannot long have dealings with that God who is a consuming fire before He will bring us by a desert pathway to the mount that burns, to the horror of a great darkness, to the sound of the trumpet which awakens the shuddering conscience, to the voice of words which proclaim the Moral Governor of the universe. There is no philosophy of Divine immanence which will thus convict the man of sin, of righteousness, of judgment. We must come face to face with the inexorable demand of 'the Eternal that loveth righteousness.' There is but one way to the land of the promise and God's dwelling-place on Zion. It leads us under the frown of Sinai.

Then there is another hill—Calvary. How did St. John the Divine reach the blissful assurance of the Fatherhood of God, the Deity of Christ, the presence of a Personal Spirit through whom we have fellowship with the Father and the Son, wherein our Christian faith issues in a sublime act of adoring love and wonder? The very God came to him in the facts of experience. He had stood by the Cross of Jesus. He had seen the water and the blood. He ran to the sepulchre. There he saw and believed. He had stood on the mountain of the final blessing and the veiling cloud. He had been baptized with Pentecostal power. Then, when at length he stood on the Ægean rock, a witness to the Godhead of the Crucified, whose blood had redeemed and was even then cleansing him from all sin, he saw within the rainbow as it spanned the summer sea the mercy-seat of the Triune God.

Why do we worship one God in Trinity? For answer I will not elaborate a long series of proofs which will avail nought to the man for whom there is no 'bow in the cloud,' who is a stranger to the covenant of grace, to whom the gift of Pentecost has not become a living reality. I will not tell you that it is the only reasonable view of God. For, even though this great mystery be for me the one mould in which the highest thought becomes possible, who am I that I should judge another man's intelligence? But we will say, as St. Paul said, 'God hath sent forth the Spirit of his son into our hearts crying, Abba, Father.' 'Because ye are sons'—that is the secret of the Apostle's language. Because we are resting on the death of Jesus as a finished work; because we have spelt out the words 'No condemnation' writ in letters of gold over the



now empty Cross; because our life as baptized believers is based on the message of Divine forgiveness—therefore we call God Father; therefore we acknowledge Him, who to us is the Author of eternal salvation, as His Incarnate Son; therefore we know that those influences which uphold our lives are not broken fragments of a universal spirit, but the whole and undivided God.

What, then, is the great strong fact of Christianity? Is it salvation through the Name of Jesus, or is it the worship of the Blessed Three? Is it the cry that goes up before the throne, 'Holy, Holy, Holy'? or is it 'Worthy is the Lamb'?

In the grey old cathedral of St. Bavo at Ghent hangs the masterpiece of Jan Van Eyck. Before you is a wide stretch of pasture, rising toward the back of the picture into low rolling hills, crowned with foliage, and beyond the towers and spires of the celestial city. The trees are laden with fruit, the meadow bright with flowers, each one painted with that exquisite patience and tender minuteness

which is the glory of early Flemish art and the counterpart of that loving workmanship with which our God, immanent in Nature, has clothed the transient grass and arrayed the lilies of the field. And in the midst, surrounded by the emblems of the Passion, and receiving the homage of apostles and martyrs, kings and priests, angels and men in a wonderful order, and pouring into a chalice on the altar the living stream of His most precious blood, stands the Lamb as it had been slain. Over the whole scene the Holy Dove spreads the benediction of His brooding presence. And seated on a great throne, with hand uplifted in blessing over a world that gathers at His feet, is the crowned figure of the Eternal Father.

It is no paradox but a plain truth, which, while others reason, we Christians know. The worship of Him of whom and through whom and in whom are all things and the adoration of the Lamb are all one.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. G. Simpson, *Christian Ideals*, 323.

## Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

FURTHER Mousterian deposits, deeply stratified, have been found in the caves at Athlit, where Miss Garrod has been conducting excavations. Another skeleton, resembling *Palaeanthropus Palestinus*, has been discovered in the third layer. It should be remembered, however, that this type of ancient Palestinian man is only a transitional one, and has features which make it difficult for him to be the direct ancestor of man. Sir Arthur Keith is of opinion that the evolutionary cradle-land of modern humanity lies much farther to the east, and has yet to be discovered. Whether it will be found in Mesopotamia, as some think, remains to be seen. In recent years important prehistoric work has been done at such ancient sites as Nippur, Babylon, Ur, and Kish, but no human remains or artifacts much older than 4000 B.C. have thus far been unearthed. Probably, no scholar any longer believes that the birthplace of man was in Palestine or Mesopotamia. In recent years Central Asia has come to have the best claim to be the earliest home of mankind.

Some time ago the excavators at *Tell Billah*, in Assyria, had the good fortune to discover a number of cuneiform documents antedating the period of

Ashurnasirpal II. (ninth cent. B.C.). Though these are in an exceedingly poor state of preservation only one of them having been baked, they have been tentatively transliterated by Professor Chiera of Chicago. The majority of them have been found to be dated to years of Assyrian eponyms, belonging to the Middle Assyrian period, and therefore much earlier than any of our hitherto discovered lists. This method of dating by the Assyrian Canon or calendar (the *limu* lists), in which every year bore the name of an Assyrian officer (an 'eponym'), has enabled us to fix the dates of many Biblical events accurately, without being dependent on the Biblical chronology. The Assyrian dynastic chronicles are not always trustworthy, for they give the dynasties one after the other as if they succeeded each other whereas we know now that several of them were contemporaneous. Such chronicles as these were the source from which Berossus drew his information, and for this reason his dating is not always correct. With the Assyrian eponym calendar however, the case is different. This calendar exists in several copies, all agreeing with each other, and so far as hitherto found covers the period from

893 B.C. (during the reign of Adad-nirari II.) to about 650 B.C. (during the reign of Ashurbanipal). The date of all the years has been determined from the mention of a total solar eclipse, which is stated to have occurred in the month Sivan, in the eponymate of Bur-Sagale. Astronomers have discovered that this eclipse, visible at Nineveh, occurred on June 15th, 763 B.C., and by means of this authentic guide it has been easy to determine all the dates in the Assyrian Canon, such as that of the battle of Karkar (at which King Ahab was present) in 854 B.C. Now, with the discovery of these *Billah* tablets, going back at least to Shalmaneser I. (early part of the thirteenth cent. B.C.), the eponymously attested dates will be carried back several centuries. In view of the obvious importance of the discoveries, Professor Chiera hopes to publish the results as soon as the tablets have been sufficiently treated to bear adequate handling. It is possible that considerable light may be thrown on the earlier dates of Israelite history, for which at present we have no authentic guide.

A curious discovery made by Mr. C. Leonard Woolley at 'Ur of the Chaldees' seems to show that the religious customs of the Sumerians and those of the ancient Hebrews were not unconnected. In excavating a temple, dated about 2700 B.C., he found three pits beneath the mud-brick floor of the court. In one of these, measuring fifteen feet by twelve, a number of gypsum blocks, probably 'unhewn stones,' had been laid. These blocks, which must have been brought from a great distance, do not appear to have been intended to strengthen any superstructure, but must have served as the sacred foundation of an altar. There is no other instance of such a thing in Sumerian texts, but it was the custom of the Hebrews to build their altars with 'unhewn stones' (cf. Ex 20<sup>25</sup>, Jos 8<sup>31</sup>). In the case at Ur, no doubt, the stones are beneath, and not in the altar itself, but it seems probable that they were meant to consecrate the superstructure, and thus they bear some relation to the unhewn stones of the Mosaic tradition. On the floor of the large cave at Gezer was found an early Amorite altar, consisting of a rough undressed stone block, eighteen inches square, with the skeleton of an infant stretched upon it. Other examples found are of the same rough type. No case of an ancient altar built with dressed stones has yet been discovered. In Herod's temple at Jerusalem, as in Solomon's, the altar of burnt-offering was of unhewn stones, and the priests approached it by an ascent of the same kind. Perhaps the custom may have been due to the idea in primitive times that the

*numen* inhabiting the altar-stone would be driven out or perhaps injured by the process of dressing. Probably, if the long-lost site of the city of Agade (Akkad) in Mesopotamia, where the famous Sargon reigned (c. 2752 B.C.), could be discovered, we would receive valuable new information regarding these and other early Semitic customs. The Oxford Field Museum Expedition, under Mr. L. C. Watelin, which has been excavating at Kish for twelve winters, has now set itself to search for this ancient city, and if it is successful we may expect much light thrown on the early period—now largely a gap—between the Flood and Abraham.

Sufficient has perhaps been said already about *Teleilat Ghassûl*,<sup>1</sup> but in the current issue of *Syria* Père Mallon has furnished us with a new and authentic account of the excavations, together with a detailed list of all the 'finds.' So far, there have been two campaigns of three months each, the first during the winter of 1929-30, with the collaboration of M. René Neuville, Chancellor of the French Consulate at Jerusalem, and the second during 1930-31, with the help of Robert Koeppl, D.Sc., Tübingen. The remains cover a stretch of 875 yards from north to south and 438 from east to west, and include two principal mounds with a large depression between, which represent apparently two ancient cities. The excavators have recognized four levels of occupation, separated from each other by layers of ashes and wind-blown earth, and corresponding to four successive periods of habitation. The most ancient of these rests on the sandy foundation which had formed the bottom of the sea in the Quaternary period, and here at one part a pavement of bricks has been found. The other levels rise about three feet above each other. The houses are of the rectangular type; and the building stones have no sign of cutting, having been utilized just as they were picked up in the neighbourhood, while the bricks, which are very solid and superior in density to those of Jericho, have been mostly made by hand, without a mould (many of them still bear the imprint of the workmen's fingers), and are rectangular, cylindrical, semi-spherical, or other shapes. The same type of civilization (which Neuville terms 'Ghassûlian') is revealed in all the levels, though with a certain amount of development towards the top. We have thus on the same site an evolution from the Stone Age (the flint

<sup>1</sup> *Teleilat* is the plural of *Teleil* or *Tuleil*, 'a little hill'; *Ghassûl* comes from *Ghasala*, the Arab name of the alkaline washing-plant which grows among the ruins. The site lies between the Hills of Moab and the Jordan, and a few miles north of the Dead Sea.



implements seem to be extremely abundant) to the Bronze Age, and this appears both in the ceramics and in the tools. The cities, Mallon reasserts, must have flourished during the latter part of the fourth millennium and existed until about 2000 B.C. (the time of Abraham), when they were destroyed and definitely abandoned. This dating seems to be accepted by Sir Flinders Petrie, Dr. Clarence S. Fisher, Père Vincent, Professor Garstang, and others who have visited the site. But whether these cities were Sodom and Gomorrah is still undetermined. In the first number of *Biblica* for 1933, Mallon again contests the view that the Cities of the Plain were at the south end of the Dead Sea.

A third campaign of work (the first was begun in 1927), under the young Italian archaeologist, Dr. Renato Bartoccini, has just been conducted on the site of Rabbath-Ammon, the chief city of the Ammonites (the descendants of Lot) mentioned in the Old Testament, situated about twenty-five miles north-east of the Dead Sea, in the fruitful valley which forms the upper course of the Jabbok. Under Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus) the city was rebuilt and called 'Philadelphia,' but the original name is still preserved in the modern 'Amman.' Already Europeans and Americans have vied with each other in making the site one of the most important centres of archaeological research. Its history is so bound up with that of Israel that much in the latter may be explained when the excavators reach the lower levels, beneath the superstructure of Roman and Byzantine remains. Meantime the Roman acropolis and temple buildings are being uncovered. The city comes into special prominence during the reign of David, who was obliged to make war upon it to wipe out the insult given to his ambassadors (cf. 2 S 10-12). It was captured at this time by Joab. David's commander-in-chief, though it was afterwards reoccupied by the Ammonites. The chief deity was Molech or Milcom (1 K 11<sup>7-23</sup>), whose religion was of a specially cruel type, corresponding to the national characteristics.

At *Tell en-Nasbeh* (Mizpah), near Ramallah, north of Jerusalem, Professor W. F. Badè has now cleared and mapped the remaining sections of the city walls (sixteen feet thick, and once over twenty-five feet high in some parts). He has found that in two places the main wall had not been carried to bedrock, but had been raised over debris containing a large number of Early Iron potsherds, which demonstrates that it was not built earlier than about 900 B.C. He has found evidence that

it was destroyed about 701 B.C., which coincides with the campaign of Sennacherib. This Assyrian monarch, the successor of Sargon II., plundered the cities of Beth-Dagon, Joppa, Bene-Berah, and Azur, and then took all the cities of Judah by force, and prepared to besiege Jerusalem. In the overthrow of Mizpah, we have thus another instance of this conqueror's warlike activities. The city was rebuilt later, but not the wall, for later houses seem to have been built over the top of this. The outstanding work of the season has been the exposing of the principal city gate, which has been found on the east side of the city, and is uncommonly well preserved, being one of the finest of this period so far found in Palestine. The entrance to the gate measures thirteen feet in width, and the stone door-sockets are still in place, with interesting stone benches inside. Here, as in most Palestinian towns, appear to have been 'broad places,' devoted to judicial business, traffic, popular assemblies, and gossip (cf. 2 K 7<sup>2</sup>, 2 Ch 3<sup>24</sup>, Job 29<sup>7</sup>, Neh 8<sup>2-3</sup>). The gates of a city were symbolical of its might, and hence we read of 'the gates of Hades' (Mt 16<sup>18</sup>), i.e. the powers of Hades (traditionally described as a city).

Work has been going on vigorously at Jericho, under the careful directorship of Professor Garstang. The results for Biblical history are so numerous that they can only be briefly mentioned here. First, a strong fortress of Hittite construction has been uncovered, belonging, according to the pottery fragments and other evidence, to about 1200 B.C. The walls are from four to six feet thick, and faced with rough polygonal blocks, the whole building being somewhat similar to the type of Hittite palace or *hulam* at Sinjerli and elsewhere in the north. 'It would seem,' says Professor Garstang, 'that about the time when the Philistines were established upon the sea-board of Palestine, the Pharaohs reasserted their control of the trade-routes of the interior by establishing upon the ruins of Jericho an outpost of Hittite mercenaries.' Second, the Bronze Age levels have now been tested by stratigraphic methods. The deposits, consisting of local pottery and painted fabrics, have been found to coincide with the age of Thutmose III. and his immediate successors, i.e. about the fifteenth cent. B.C. This dating date has been determined by the freshness of motive and execution in the local types, and especially by 'the total absence of any Mykenan wares or imitations among the thousands of specimens that have been turned up, washed, and scrutinized.' The stratigraphic examination is thus in harmony with the evidence afforded by the

rooms, showing an interruption in the occupation of the city about the time of Amenophis III. (c. 1385 B.C.), and thus placing the entrance of Joshua during this period. Third, the signs of fierce conflagration at this time are evident everywhere. The palace, with its living chambers and external store-rooms of oil and grain, is found to have been burned in places to the ground, showing thick deposits of charcoal (in some places two feet in depth) and pockets of white ash. The traces of terrific conflagration, indeed, are so impressive that Professor Garstang is of the view that 'such an effect could only have been obtained by studied preparation.' Fourth, below this stratum of the Late Bronze Age, a Hyksos building containing twenty or more rooms, has been unearthed. It is altogether exceptional, exceeding by far the requirements of a local king. Here store vessels have been found stamped or sealed by Treasury officials of the Hyksos age. It seems possible that Jericho in this earlier period marked the site of what Garstang calls 'a vast emporium of the Hyksos kings.'

Mr. J. Crowfoot, the director of the Samaria excavations, has now made a detailed report on the remarkable carved ivories discovered there. These include pieces in the round, plaques in relief, and plaques in pierced work (*ajouré*). They seem to have formed part of the decorated furniture in Ahab's house, having been used for the framework of cabinets, couches, tables, stools, or toilet-boxes, and perhaps also for the wainscoting of rooms. It is clear that such ivories were largely used for these decorative purposes. A noteworthy characteristic is that, with the exception of a few purely Egyptian, the decorations correspond largely with those in Solomon's temple (1 K. 6-10). The lions, oxen, sphinx, papyrus, palm-trees, flowers, iron-work, and other subjects all find a parallel in Solomon's ornamentation. There must have been skilled workers in ivory, probably Phœnician artists, resident in Samaria, just as Solomon is known to have brought his special artificers from Tyre. Perhaps some craftsmen moved about with their patterns from one court to another.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### GENA.

SURELY the Book of Malachi has never been subjected to so thorough an investigation as it has received from Balmann.<sup>1</sup> His elaborate introduction of five hundred and twelve pages, published over six years ago, has now been followed by a Commentary running to five hundred and ninety-nine pages, which is as interesting as it is elaborate. Nothing seems to have escaped him. At every point the text is considered in the light of the versions, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, and even old Slavonic, as well, of course, as Greek and Latin. Not is the thread torn just above the most tedious details. The discussions attaching to individual verses, which usually extend to several pages, and once—in the case of the famous 1<sup>st</sup>—to no less than twenty-seven, always conclude with an enlightening summary. The most recent, as well as the older books, by the scholars of many nations, are all laid under contribution. But Balmann is not oppressed by his learning. He takes his own

line, and he can always give reasons for the line that is in him. On 1<sup>st</sup>, for example, for 'and this again (or the second time, *נאח*, ye do,' he reads 'and this, which I hate, *נאח* (*נאח*), ye do.' More important is his treatment of 2<sup>nd</sup>, which is usually interpreted as an expression of the divine hostility to divorce: he renders it, 'dismiss (or divorce) her whom the God of Israel hates.' Occasionally, as here, he puts the less generous construction upon utterances of Malachi which have been customarily regarded as great prophetic words. In 1<sup>st</sup>, for example, in whose name scholars find a noble tribute to heathen worship, he takes the reference to be to the worship, at Jahweh sanctuaries, of the Jews of the Diaspora. The highly controversial 2<sup>nd</sup>, which a Dutch scholar has characterized as the most difficult verse in the Old Testament, he renders thus: 'No one has done this, who (reading *נאח* for *נאח*) has any share in the spirit (of God).'

He brings out very clearly the contrast between Malachi and the pre-exilic prophets, especially Jeremiah. They say that the cult is worthless, in comparison with the ethical demands of Jahweh: he says, it is worthless, because it is incorrectly

<sup>1</sup> *Kommentar zum Buch des Propheten Malachi*, von Alexander von Balmann, Verlag von J. G. Krüger, Berlin.



practised. To them the noblest expression of religion is morality, to him it is the correct cult. The denunciation in 3<sup>6</sup>, which reveals Malachi as inspired by the same regard for ethical interests as his predecessors, is aimed, in Bulmerincq's opinion, at the Samaritans. They are those who meantime prosper (2<sup>17</sup> 3<sup>15</sup>) despite their wickedness, but over the dust of whose charred bodies the temple community will march in triumphal procession when Jahweh appears 3<sup>19</sup> (E.V. 4<sup>1</sup>). This illustrates a favourite point of Bulmerincq's, that the message of Malachi is conceived in terms of eschatology, even the *הָרָם* with which the book closes being brought under this conception.

Minute grammatical points are treated with a fullness that would gladden the heart of König. Of the many points of textual interest may be mentioned the difficult 3<sup>6</sup>, which he thus emends on the basis of the LXX, 'I, Jahweh, change not, but you, ye sons of Jacob, *do not cease from your sins*, לא תִּרְצֹחַם מִצְוֹתַיִם'. The larger questions of interpretation and historical background are treated with equal thoroughness. The marriage contract of the Hebrews, for example 2<sup>14</sup>, is illustrated from the Elephantine papyri, and the incorrect cult is responsible for the delay in the dawning of the Messianic day, when the sun of salvation would arise with healing in its wings, 3<sup>20</sup> (E.V. 4<sup>2</sup>).

Professor Schlatter was led by his New Testament studies to a fresh examination of Judaism, which furnishes the theological background of the early Church. In his volume on 'The Theology of Judaism'<sup>1</sup> he confines his attention to Josephus, whom he regards, despite his admiration for Rome and his interest in the Greeks, as in many ways a characteristic exponent of that Judaism. His learned and exhaustive discussion deals in successive chapters with The Creator of Nature, The Lord of Man, The People of God, Piety, Righteousness, Free Thought, The Pharisaic Movement, The Zealot Movement, The Gnostic Ferment, The Relation of Israel to Other Nations, and The Future. Every page attests Schlatter's intimate familiarity not only with Josephus, whom he quotes extensively, but with Philo and contemporary Jewish literature. We learn much about Judaism in general, and about Josephus in particular—about the extreme importance attached to the Law and the Sabbath, about the festival of lights

and the *ξυλοφόρια*, about the obligation to charity, work, and truthfulness, about the conception of duty to God and man as *εὐσέβεια* and *δικαιοσύνη* respectively, about prayer and conscience (*τὸ συνειδός*), about fate and the freedom of the will, about the strength of gnostic influences, and much else. Also the linguistic usages of Josephus, which are significant for his thinking, are dealt with in a masterly way. He speaks, for example, of the greatness (*μεγαλειότης*) rather than of the holiness (*ἀγιοσύνη*) of God, he avoids the phrase *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* and uses *θεῖος* for the Palestinian *עֲדִיר*, prefers Lord to Father as the name of God, uses *δέσποτα* in prayer rather than *κύριε*, and seldom calls God *βασιλεύς*. Despite his belief in the inspiration of the Old Testament, he does not hesitate to incorporate legends about the birth of Moses, his war with the Ethiopians, and his marriage with an Ethiopian princess. He has so profound a respect for 'that which is written,' especially by Greeks or in Greek, that he relates without challenge the fantastic story of Aristeeas as to the origin of the Greek translation of the Old Testament. On the other hand, he is not demonstrably acquainted with the historians, such as Polybius or Strabo, and still less with the philosophers. But he was very much at home in the Græco-Roman world, and the Pharisaism which his person and writings illustrate goes far to explain the opposition which Judaism offered alike to Jesus and Paul. This book is illuminating as well as learned and lucid.

It would be quite impossible for any one who was not himself an expert in agriculture to do even the remotest justice to the extraordinary richness and variety of the contents of Dalman's volume on Agriculture in Palestine.<sup>2</sup> He knows the land, the people, the language, the soil, as few know any one of them. The book is an amazing blend of the scholar and the practical man. Here is discussed with an expertness due to long and intimate familiarity the geological origin of the Palestinian soil, the influence of climate upon it, the various kinds of soil, the conditions of land tenure, the methods adopted for protecting the fields, the implements used and the animals engaged in agriculture, the preparation and artificial irrigation of the soil, its various products, plants, wheat, vegetables, fruit, weeds, the injury wrought by men and animals, etc. etc. Account is taken of

<sup>1</sup> *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus*, von Professor A. Schlatter (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; kart. Mk.14; geb. Mk.16).

<sup>2</sup> *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, Band ii. Der Ackerbau, von Gustav Dalman (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; kart. Mk.21; geb. Mk.24).

all these things both in antiquity and modern times, and the whole range of the relevant literature, ancient and modern, is as an open book to Dalman. To this he adds a complete mastery of modern Arabic and Hebrew, which enables him to give the modern names for everything he mentions, and to quote in their own language the sayings of the tillers of the soil. The book is therefore, but without the least suspicion of pedantry, of value to the student of linguistics as well as of agriculture. Naturally the Bible receives illumination at innumerable points, for example, the Parable of the Sower, Ec 3<sup>5</sup>, etc. etc.; there are literally hundreds of Biblical references carefully registered in the Appendix, where are also to be found lists of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic words mentioned in the discussion. Not the least remarkable feature of a remarkable book is the series of eighty-one admirably executed illustrations of plants, wheat, peasants, ploughs, cattle, camels, plain, wilderness, etc. Only a man of exceptional gifts, experience, and opportunities could have written a book of interest so manifold.

A. J. Festugière, O.P., in a book on *The Religious Ideal of the Greeks and the Gospel*,<sup>1</sup> for which Lagrange has written a preface, traces in an interesting and moving way the progress of Greek religious thought from Plato through Aristotle, Epicurus, the Stoics, and the Neopythagoreans, illustrating its strength and its weakness; and he seeks to show how, by virtue of its very defects, it ensured a welcome for the gospel. The cry from Macedonia (Ac 16<sup>9</sup>) was for a deliverance which the way hitherto taken by Greek thought had been impotent to effect. It was too much an aristocratic way, a way of contemplation, a way for the philosopher by which he achieved his own salvation; and for the later period the shadow of Fate hung over all. 'How sweetly must the promises of Jesus have fallen' upon a world dominated by this idea of Fate. When instead of Fate men saw the Father, whose love was interpreted by the Son upon His cross, then the most solitary heart could accept its suffering, because she could offer it to a God who

had Himself suffered for her. The Stoic ἀραγήα was offset by the Pauline χαρά. There are important supplementary discussions on the origins of the idea of God in Plato, on Aristotle in Greek Christian literature up to Theodoret, on St. Paul and Marcus Aurelius, and—most interesting of all—on the religious value of the magical papyri, in which the writer emphasizes the immense difference between magical incantations, whose aim was to control the god, and Christian prayer, in which God is Lord and the believer His servant, whose aim is not to use but to glorify Him.

In the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*,<sup>2</sup> Krause, discussing Amos, regards him as exclusively a prophet of doom, with a message exclusively addressed to the northern kingdom, but also as a forerunner of Deuteronomy in the sense that, when he says, 'Seek not Bethel,' he implies that all would be well if they sought Jerusalem. This is surely more than doubtful. Möller discusses the strophic structure of the Psalms. Rowley, writing on 'The bilingual problem of Daniel,' contends that the Hebrew and the Aramaic portions of the book are both from the same hand, and that both are original, the Hebrew section being written last and ch. 1 later than the body of the book. Menes, in 'Temple and Synagogue,' notes that, besides Ps 74<sup>8</sup>, there are other passages in the Old Testament which suggest the synagogue; he makes skilful use of Jos 22<sup>9-34</sup> (P) as illustrating the existence of a 'sanctuary without sacrifice' (a post-exilic usage with quasi-historical precedent in the early period), and discusses Ezk 11<sup>14ff.</sup> 20<sup>39f.</sup>, Ps 51<sup>17ff.</sup> 69<sup>31f.</sup> in the light of this: he also makes the interesting suggestion that P is essentially the creation of the *non*-Jerusalemite priests, who were degraded to the second rank by the Deuteronomic reform. Galling discusses Koheleth, emphasizing the aphoristic nature and the Egyptian colouring of the book. Budde shows that Goethe anticipated Sellin by one hundred and sixty years in the view that Moses died a violent death. Sellin criticises with asperity the conduct of the German excavations at Shechem during the four and a half years preceding October 1932. JOHN E. MCFADVEN.

Trinity College, Glasgow.

<sup>1</sup> *L'Idéal religieux des Grecs et l'Évangile*, par A. J. Festugière (Librairie Lecoffre, Rue Bonaparte, 90, Paris).

<sup>2</sup> 1932, Heft 4 (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.5).



## Contributions and Comments.

### Ps. xii.—As used by Christ and St. Paul.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for January, p. 150, and also for March, in the article, 'The Strangest "Word" of Jesus,' the suggestion is made that the cry from the Cross, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me,' is not one of dereliction; but rather that our Lord was repeating to Himself this Psalm of trust and was overheard repeating its opening verse.

Did St. Paul, also, when in prison, facing death, anchor himself to this song of trust? Professor Lock in the I.C.C. on *The Pastoral Epistles* (p. 116) finds nine parallels between this Psalm and St. Paul's last words as recorded in 2 Ti 4<sup>10-18</sup>, and says: 'Had St. Paul, like his Master, been saying this Psalm in the hour of desertion?'

Could it be that St. Paul knew, possibly through Mark or Luke, that the current interpretation of the word on the Cross by the disciples referred the cry not to a sense of utter desolation and desertion, but to the beginning of an act of complete trust which conquered in the hour of loneliness? and so, did he purposely use the Psalm which his Master had used as he completed his victory?

JOHN TORRANCE.

Rothiemay, Banffshire.

### Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel.

THE article by Mr. Greville Lewis in the February number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES calls for comment and review.

Since the publication of my *Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel*, research has added to the results there recorded. First came my rearrangement of the tenth chapter (adopted by Dr. Moffatt, I infer, while his *New Testament* was passing through the press, as he did not notice the need to remove the white lines which dislocate the narrative of 9-10). Then came the very remarkable confirmation of the size of the page I had detected by J. M. Thompson. There followed Dr. Macgregor's work on chs. 7 and 8, and now Mr. Greville Lewis calls us to what is really a congestion of problems. His article is not really on the same plane of investigation. He has ignored what I have just mentioned:

the ascertained size of the page. This I reckoned in lines, and Thompson, if I remember rightly, in letters. And all research on this plane is on that basis. It may be that the fragments that Mr. Lewis moves about are out of place—I say nothing of that here—but, if so, they present an entirely different problem.

What, I think, is desirable is the reconsideration of the place of 2<sup>23-31</sup> (exactly three pages). This may be entirely separated from the 'Cleansing of the Temple,' which, I am convinced, stands at the end of Christ's first year, with Mk 2<sup>18-36</sup> (cf. Mt 12<sup>6</sup>), as seen in my *Jesus of Galilee*. And here I am grateful to Mr. Lewis for asking, 'Could Jesus, as a comparatively unknown provincial, have thus routed the powerful vested interests of the Temple?' (I should have said 'challenged' rather than 'routed,' for they were probably soon back at the business.) Grateful, for it has helped me to see Jesus more clearly as He 'fulfils' the long prophetic 'burden' that began with Amos. Amos was very 'provincial,' and his seventh chapter—prophet (unofficial) against priest and 'royal sanctuary'—is the first of that long book which records the clash of the two religions of Israel, a book of which the 'Cleansing' is the penultimate chapter and Golgotha the last.

I fear that the conflation in Mr. Lewis's paper of two problems, that of the leaves, and that of passages very much shorter, has rendered his contention difficult to accept as it stands to-day.

There remain (i) the question of the right location of the three pages (2<sup>23-31</sup>), and this may prove to be in ch. 12; (ii) the placing of 3<sup>12f.</sup>. Here we have words of Christ (v. 12) torn from their provenance, and immediately merging into a long 'Evangelistic' comment (3<sup>13-21, 31-36</sup>) of the same kind as that found in ch. 12.

We may find that this leads us to a Gospel by 'John' (whoever he was) which fell to pieces, and to which on rearrangement the editor added his now well-known commentary, and interpolations (which are 'another story').

F. WARBURTON LEWIS.

Manchester.

### A Suggested Dislocation in the Text of St. John xiv.-xvi.

DIFFICULTY has long been felt and expressed as to the order of the discourses at the Last Supper.



As Dr. A. E. Brooke puts it in Peake's *Commentary on the Bible* (p. 758): 'The last words of chapter 14 mark the end of the discourse. . . . The command, "Arise, let us go hence," does not find its counterpart till 18<sup>1</sup>. . . . Some of the matter in 15 and 16 certainly seems to come naturally before parts of 14. The pruning of the Vine fits on admirably to the teaching which followed the expulsion of the traitor. On the other hand the mention of the Paraclete in 14 seems to be prior to what is taught of Him in 15 and 16.'

The hypothesis of a purely mechanical dislocation of the text removes these difficulties. Such a hypothesis has brought back sense and order in Cicero's Letters, where the recovery of the true order has been demonstrated to be correct because it brought together again the dissevered fragments of the word at the fissures. Similar demonstration is impossible in the Gospel, because there are no words parted into pieces. The test must be whether the reconstructed text reads as a more consecutive discourse than does what we have at present.

What hypothesis then offers? If the archetype were a book, not a roll, we may conceive of these chapters as written on three sheets, folded double to give four pages each, in the same way as our common writing-paper is folded to give four pages a sheet. The sheets, however, would be so written that in each the first and the third pages only<sup>1</sup> would be written on. Is it an accident that when these chapters are distributed in this way on six pages we have them so arranged that the mere disturbance of one sheet might give the present order instead of the following, which, it may be suggested, is the true and original order:

A 15 <sup>1-16</sup>	F 14 <sup>18-31</sup>
B 14 <sup>1-17</sup>	E 16 <sup>20-end</sup>
C 15 <sup>17-164</sup>	D 16 <sup>1-20</sup>

where A and F are the first and third pages of one sheet, B and E of a second, C and D of a third—all these pages being virtually of the same size.

It will be seen at once that if the sheet AF came loose, and were first folded wrongly so that F became the first page and A the third, and then the sheet were, in error, re-inserted after B, we should at once have our present order.

<sup>1</sup> The alternative supposition of the MS. being written on both sides would leave the heart and core of our hypothesis unaffected. It would merely result that we should be shut up to the belief that the matter we have assigned to each page was spread over two pages, the *recto* and the *verso*, each taking half of what we have suggested went to a page.

In defence of this hypothesis it may be urged (1) that, if it were incorrect, it would be a remarkable coincidence of accident that such a transposition could nevertheless be suggested and be allowed as possible by the lengths of the pages, and (2) that it is known that papyrus rolls were by no means the only common form of book, especially, it may be said, in Asia Minor where the factories of Pergamum turned out writing material in plenty (it is not necessary to call in the curious discovery of Dr. Mingana that a Syriac copy declares John the Younger to have written the Gospel in Bithynia).

The ultimate test, however, as has been said above, must be whether a majority of readers find this suggested order in the Last Discourse more satisfying to the intelligence, and this test the present article is intended to invite them to make. One result of the proposed re-arrangement would be that the prayer of chapter 17 will have been uttered when our Lord had just risen from table but before He left the Upper Room. This is better certainly than to suppose that He was still reclining at table, and perhaps better than to interpret, as Westcott does, 18<sup>1</sup> as meaning 'went out' of the City.

It may be remarked in conclusion (to enter the field of mere conjecture) that accepting the attribution of these three chapters to three sheets with six written pages of the archetype, we shall estimate thirty sheets or sixty written pages for the entire Gospel. We may then conjecture these sheets to have been folded into two fascicles of fifteen<sup>2</sup> sheets or thirty written pages each, and in that case it would appear, if we count from the beginning of the Gospel, that the end of the tenth page of the second fascicle would come about 13<sup>8</sup>, and the thirteenth page would start after 13<sup>38</sup> as our hypothesis would require. This approximation is at least curious, if it is accidental. The deranged sheets will thus be the three inner sheets (Nos. 13, 14, 15), in the second fascicle of fifteen (the pages being pp. 43-48), and it should be observed that, unless the sheet bearing the pages which we have called C and D came in the middle of a fascicle, the pages would not be consecutive. That it does so come in our reconstruction of the MS. is strong confirmation of its correctness.

T. NICKLIN.

*Hulme Hall, Manchester University.*

<sup>2</sup> It is less likely that the fascicles would be as small as five sheets, in which case the third page in the fifth fascicle would begin after 13<sup>38</sup>, and the three sheets we have postulated would be the middle three in that fascicle.



## Note on 1 Corinthians xi. 24, 25.

VERSE <sup>24</sup>, for τοῦτο μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα, etc., read τοῦτο μὲν ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα, etc.; v. <sup>25</sup>, for τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, etc., read τοῦτο δέ τὸ ποτήριον. It will be noted the word μου is in front of τὸ σῶμα in 1 Co II <sup>24</sup>; in Matthew, Mark, and Luke it follows τὸ σῶμα. Its abnormal position in Corinthians suggests it was mistaken for μεν. Is St. Paul not attempting to place the cibum of Pliny's letter to Trajan on a more solemn basis? Hence he passes on to the Corinthians what he has received from the Lord Himself? St. Paul knows that his description of the Last Supper is a personal description written with a purpose. These emendations remove the basis on which the world has been divided—the 'das ist' advocates can unite with 'das heisst' advocates because both are in all likelihood wrong.

There are far too many τοῦτος in these two sentences, and that suggests they did not all mean the same thing.

Translating now v. <sup>24</sup>, τοῦτο μὲν, etc., 'first, there is the body broken for you'; v. <sup>25</sup>, τοῦτο δέ, etc., 'secondly, the cup is the new covenant ratified in my blood'. Alternatively, perhaps, the vernacular could drop the μὲν and δέ and the sense would still be 'first' and 'secondly.'

JAMES MILROY M'QUEEN.

Halesowen, Worcestershire.

## The Term 'Scripture(s)' in the New Testament.

ἡ γραφή and αἱ γραφαί are the most common designation of 'Scripture(s).' Lightfoot (on Gal. iii. 22) laid down the ruling that 'the singular γραφή in the N.T. always means a particular passage of Scripture,' the plural γραφαί being universally found 'where the reference is clearly to the sacred writings as a whole.' Many commentators take this view. But as regards the use of ἡ γραφή there is some evidence which suggests that the distinction is not absolute. The singular occurs thirty times in the N.T. (omitting Mk 15<sup>28</sup> as unauthentic). In twenty-one of these it is clear that a particular passage is intended, since the actual O.T. citation is given in the context. In nine instances no citation is given. In at least four of these no single passage seems to be in mind. In Jn 2<sup>22</sup> and 7<sup>38</sup> the reference is apparently to the general tenor of a combination of passages. 2 Ti 3<sup>16</sup> and 2 P 1<sup>20</sup> suggest a still more comprehensive sense: 'every (book of) scripture,' 'no prophecy

of scripture.' It is interesting to notice that the Letter of Aristæus uses ἡ γραφή, not only (§ 155) to introduce a specific O.T. quotation, but also (§ 168) to denote the Mosaic Law in general. It would appear, therefore, that there is more flexibility in the N.T. use of ἡ γραφή than Lightfoot's canon allows. There are classical precedents for the comprehensive sense of γραφή indicating a section or the whole of a book.

One further point. Do the two terms denote the O.T. alone, or have they the wider reference that includes any Christian writings which may have been in circulation? 1 Ti 5<sup>18b</sup> cites the saying recorded in Lk 10<sup>7</sup>. It is doubtful, however, whether the introductory phrase ἡ γραφή embraces the second citation. The 'every scripture' of 2 Ti 3<sup>16</sup> is surely explanatory of the 'sacred writings' of v. <sup>15</sup>, which clearly signify the O.T. Bussmann<sup>1</sup> has argued that κατὰ τὰς γραφάς in 1 Co 15<sup>3</sup>. 4 refers not to the O.T. but to a written Passion and Resurrection story. But is it not very questionable whether in the formative period of the gospel tradition the term 'Scripture' could have been applied to any such narratives? 2 P 3<sup>16</sup> is a well-known crux. But the phrase 'the other scriptures' is ambiguous, and there is no certain equation of St. Paul's letters with the canonical writings of the O.T. The presumption is that the term 'Scripture(s)' in the N.T. means only the O.T. writings.

H. G. MEECHAM.

Hartley College, Manchester.

## Fiction.

A LETTER which appeared in the Guardian of December 23rd, 1932, was quoted in the March number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. In this letter the writer stated that some religious publications sent to the Irish Free State were stopped by the Customs and were stated to be liable to tax, because Protestant literature is classed as 'fiction.' This statement is totally incorrect. Religious publications are free from tax, and there is no discrimination between Protestant and Catholic religious literature.

CHARLES EASON.

Dublin.

<sup>1</sup> See Vincent Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, 48 f.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.